Google

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at http://books.google.com/

THE

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS

HELD AT

NORWICH, OCTOBER, 1895.

ADENEY & SON,

ESTABLISHED 1774.

UNDER THE HIGHEST PATRONAGE.

Clerical and General Tailors,

16, SACKVILLE STREET,

PICCADILLY,

LONDON, W.

THE

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS,

HELD AT NORWICH,

ON OCTOBER 8TH, 9TH, 10TH, AND 11TH,

1895.

EDITED BY THE REV. C. DUNKLEY,

Vicar of S. Mary's, Wolverhampton.

London:

BEMROSE & SONS, LTD., 23, OLD BAILEY;

AND DERBY.

1895.

The Corporation of the Church House,

DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

President:

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Vice-Presidents:

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF WESTMINSTER.

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

VIEW OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CHURCH HOUSE, SHEWING THE GREAT HALL NOW APPROACHING COMPLETION.

Some ways of helping to complete the Church House.

(1) By Donation to the Building Fund.

(2) By becoming a Member of the Corporation.

Membership of the Corporation may be acquired by persons of either sex (being members of the Church of England or of any Church in full communion therewith) by an Annual Subscription of at least One Guinea; Life Membership by a Donation in one sum of at least Ten Guineas.

(3) By becoming an Associate.

Associates, who must be recommended by a Member of the Corporation, are admitted to the Library and Reading Room on the payment of Five Shillings a year.

(4) By taking a Collecting Card.

(5) By giving a Drawing Room or Garden Meeting.

(6) By organizing a Parish Meeting.

(7) By Church Offertory.

(8) By Legacy.

Communications should be addressed to the Secretary, SYDNEY W. FLAMANK, Esq., Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.; or to the Organizing Secretary, the Rev. J. A. BETTS, Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.

PREFACE.

THE Thirty-fifth Meeting of the Church Congress, held in the city of Norwich for the second time, will rank with the best of the long series of Congresses, notwithstanding the gloomy predictions which went before, and the caustic criticisms which followed after it.

The value of a Church Congress cannot be accurately appraised by the syllabus of subjects, or by the list of invited Readers and Speakers, or by the muster roll of its members, or even by the amount of interest and enthusiasm it arouses, but by the character and quality of the principal papers and speeches; and, judged by this standard, Norwich Congress falls no whit behind its predecessors. There have been larger, more lively, more brilliant, and, perhaps, more conspicuously successful Congresses, but estimated by the chief contributions to the discussions, none of greater and more permanent practical value.

A glance backward over thirty years to the first Norwich Congress, held in 1865, reveals great changes. In this interval —long indeed when regarded in the light of a transient life, but inexpressibly short when measured by the life of a Church which reckons its history by the centuries—many who took a prominent part in the earlier Congress have passed away, and have entered, we trust, into the everlasting rest. Among these we can recall the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson); the Bishops of Norwich (Dr. Pelham); Oxford (Dr. S. Wilberforce); Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth); S. Andrew's (Dr. Chas. Wordsworth); and Grahamstown; the Deans of Canterbury (Dr. Alford); Ely (Dr. Harvey Goodwin, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle); and Chichester (Dr. Hook); Archdeacon Allen; Dr. Pusey; Dr. J. S. Howson

334115

(afterwards Dean of Chester); Dr. Goulburn (afterwards Dean of Norwich), Dr. J. S. B. Monsell; Canons Norris and E. Hoare; Rev. T. L. Claughton (afterwards Bishop of Rochester and S. Albans); Lord Arthur C. Hervey (afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells); Dr. Hessey; Lord Harrowby; Sir R. Phillimore; Mr. A. J. B. Beresford Hope, and Mr. Robert Brett.

> "Though the Earth dispart these Earthlies, face from face,
> Yet the Heavenlies shall surely join in Heaven,
> For the Spirit hath no bonds in time or space."

A few who were at Norwich in 1865 and took part in the discussions are still with us. Among them the Bishops of Derry, Exeter, and Liverpool; Archdeacon Denison; Canons Heaviside and Meyrick; Dr. Salmon; and, though last mentioned, always first in the thoughts of Congress members, Archdeacon Emery, Permanent Secretary and reputed "Father of Church Congresses," to whose unique experience, genial oversight, wise counsels, and unsparing labours Congress mainly owes its vigorous life and growing capacity of useful service for the Church of God in this land.

In 1865 the Church Congress was little known or heard of beyond the immediate neighbourhood of the few places in which it had been held. To-day it is a household word among Churchmen, and *the* great popular Church assembly of the year. This development of the Congress is only one index of the wonderful growth of interest now manifested by all classes in the affairs and work of the Church both at home and abroad. The Church Congress has been held in nearly every diocese in England and Wales; the exceptions being London, Rochester, S. Albans, Truro, Bangor, Salisbury, and Hereford. But London, Rochester, and S. Albans have found themselves within easy distance of Congress at Brighton (1874); Croydon (1877); Reading (1882); and Folkestone (1892); and, it may be, the Permanent Committee has still sinister designs upon the two former populous dioceses. Plymouth (1876) and Exeter (1894) brought Congress into the far west. Bangor joined hands with S. Asaph in the welcome given to Congress at Rhyl (1891); Salisbury and

Hereford are agricultural dioceses, and yield no town large enough to receive Congress and its numerous visitors; but next year Shrewsbury will be a most convenient centre for the diocese of Hereford, and it will break new ground in the dioceses of Lichfield and S. Asaph.

A comparison of the programmes of 1865 and 1895 still further marks the growth of the Congress. In 1865 eleven meetings (six being sectional) were held on three days; in 1895, twenty-six meetings (fifteen being sectional) were held on four days. It appears to have been an unwritten law of Congress in its early days to limit the number of papers and prepared addresses to four, viz., two readers and two speakers. In recent years the programme has been heavily weighted with invited readers and speakers; and, mainly in consequence of this, the discussions of the subjects by voluntary speakers have often been very limited. A good deal of criticism has been directed against this comparatively recent innovation, and Subjects' Committees in future years will be wise if they aim at meeting objections which have been very emphatically expressed, and are undoubtedly widely felt. Again, in recent years the subjects selected have been elaborately dissected and subdivided; whereas in earlier years they were briefly designated in general terms.

The annually recurring complaint, "There are no new subjects," was reiterated with troublesome persistence this year in the daily and weekly journals. Norwich was in no sense a "Congress of Novelties," such as Wolverhampton in 1887; but it presented for discussion some new subjects, as well as some old subjects, of present interest and urgency, in a new light, and it made some experiments. For example, "National Education in England as compared with (*a*) the Colonies, (*b*) the Continent, etc."; "The National Church: its continuity, etc."; "The Church's Ministry, Doctrine, and Worship Confirmed, etc."; "The Church's Care of the Deaf, etc.," were new to Congress. The meeting for men only, to consider "Social Evils of the Age" was a new departure, and proved one of the finest and most serious meetings of the Congress.

The discussion of "Hindrances to Christian Unity" was carried over to a second session—a plan advocated for a long time, but only adopted this year. It proved a signal success. I have prepared for the Preface of this volume a "Comparative Table of Subjects" debated during the last ten years, and have classified them under some general headings. This Table may be of use to Subjects' Committees in the near future, and may possibly remove some misapprehension about Congress programmes of the past.

The Norwich Committee, with praiseworthy zeal, endeavoured to make Congress useful to all classes of the community. Day and evening tickets were issued without any limit of number. Working-men's meetings formed an integral part of the Congress programme, and were held every night in one of the large Halls. Meetings were also held in connection with the Congress in the principal towns of the diocese—Great Yarmouth, Lowestoft, East Dereham, Fakenham, Swaffham, Harleston, and Ipswich. Working-women had a special meeting in one of the Congress Halls. The Sundays preceding and following Congress were utilized to the fullest extent by the clergy of Norwich and the neighbourhood, and the Mission aspect of Congress was well brought out.

The Official Report has been prepared with great care; and the Editor sends it forth on its mission in the belief that no serious defect will disfigure its pages, and that it will be found in every way worthy to take its place among its companion volumes, the Reports of previous Church Congresses. A serious difficulty has confronted us—the great length of many of the papers. This is by no means a new feature; but the difficulties of Editor and Publisher have been accentuated this year in ways we had not previously experienced. Nothing can be more disappointing to a writer than to have his paper cut down ; but a process of excision will have to be faced unless Subjects' Committees in the future can persuade Readers to keep their papers within the limits of the allotted time.

I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to the many Readers and Speakers who promptly revised and returned their papers and speeches. Without their co-operation it would not have been possible to issue the Report at this early date.

To the Publishers, Messrs. Bemrose and Sons, Limited (London and Derby), great praise must be awarded for the excellence and rapidity of their work. Mr. C. Basil Cooke, Official Reporter, and his competent staff have bestowed unremitting care and attention on their task, and to them my best acknowledgments are also due. My last word must be a grateful recognition of the courtesy shown to me, and the ready help afforded on several occasions by the principal Hon. Secretary, the Ven. Archdeacon Nevill, whose labours in the cause of Congress have been, as I know from experience as an old Hon. Sec., abundant and ofttimes exacting.

This report is sent forth in the earnest hope that it may contribute to the greater glory of God, and the extension of Christ's Kingdom in the world.

C. DUNKLEY,
Editor.

S. Mary's Vicarage,
Wolverhampton,
Nov. 13*th*, 1895.

TABLE OF SUBJECTS discussed at the Church Congress, during

Working-Men's and Working-Women's

The numbers in the Table indicate that there

	CHURCH ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANISATION.			
CONGRESS, DATE.	FINANCE, &c.	GOVERNMENT.	CHURCH MINISTRIES.	
WAKEFIELD, 1886.	Patronage and Endowments.	1. Convocation Reform. Representation of Laity in Church Councils. 2. Parish Churches Bill.	1. Clerical Efficiency. Extension of Diaconate. 2. Increase of Episcopate. New Diocese.	
WOLVERHAMPTON, 1887.	Tithes Question.			Priesthood of the Laity.
MANCHESTER, 1888.	Endowments and Proportionate giving.	Lay Representation in Church Councils.	Increase of Episcopate.	1. Lay Help. 2. Common Religious life: (*a*) Clergy; (*b*) Laity.
CARDIFF, 1889.	Church Finance and Clergy Pensions.		The Ministry: Witness of Holy Scripture & History.	
HULL, 1890.				1. Brotherhoods. 2. Women's Work.
RHYL, 1891.				
FOLKESTONE, 1892.		Canon Law in connection with the Discipline and Government of the Church of England.	1. Preparation for Holy Orders, and of Laymen for Evangelists. 2. Preaching in the Church of England.	
BIRMINGHAM, 1893.	1. Patronage. Tenure. Exchange. Status of Curates. 2. Finance. Condition of Clergy. Remedies.		1. Increase of Episcopate. New Diocese. 2. Preaching and a Preaching Order.	Ministry of Laity. Lay Readers. Deaconesses. Lectors, &c.
EXETER, 1894.	1. Admission to Holy Orders. Patronage. Beneficed Clergy. Retirement. 2. Finance. Union of Benefices. New Endowments, &c.	Reform of Convocation and relation to Houses of Laymen.	1. Training and Studies of Clergy in respect of Teaching, Preaching, Ministering, Pastoring. 2. Cathedrals. Maintenance. Functions, &c.	Church Workers. Organized Ministration of Laymen. Ministry of Women.
NORWICH, 1895.	Finance affected by Agricultural Distress. Remedies.		1. Church's Ministry (Doctrine and Worship), confirmed and illustrated by recent discoveries. 2. Cathedrals. Utility. Maintenance.	

ten years, from 1886 to 1895. Compared and Classified.

Meetings are not included.

was more than one session on kindred subjects.

APOLOGETIC WORK OF THE CHURCH.			EVANGELISTIC WORK OF THE CHURCH.
CHURCH DEFENCE.	BIBLE CRITICISM.	CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE.	FOREIGN MISSIONS.
Church and State. Advantage of Established Church.		Christian Evidences.	Foreign Missions. India. Burmah. Japan.
The Church and History.			1. Church in Africa. 2. Eastern Churches.
1. Church in Wales: Tithes, Work, Vernacular Preaching. 2. Bearing of Democracy on Church life and work.	1. Recognition of Biblical Criticism in Sermons, &c. 2. Eschatology.	1. Philosophic Doubts. Atheism. Agnosticism. Pessimism. 2. Positivism.	English speaking people in Colonies and elsewhere. Mohammedans. Buddhists, &c.
1. Establishment in relation to religious equality and spiritual independence. 2. Church in Wales—Progress and Needs.		Literature of the Day, and Christianity.	Reciprocal relations between Church at home and Foreign and Colonial Missions.
Church and State.	Inspiration and Modern Criticism.	Faith as a principle of action, &c.	Africa.
The Church revival in Wales.	Criticism of Holy Scripture and the Church's gains.	The Divine Personality and belief in the same. The Agnostic, Theistic, and Christian positions.	Missionary Agents. Reflex benefits. Society System.
	1. Relation between the Authority of the Bible and the Authority of the Church. 2. Permanent value of Old Test. Educational, Evidential, Moral, &c.		1. Work of the Church of England on the Continent 2. Varieties of method in Missionary enterprise.
Anglican Communion: Relation of Church of England to Church of Ireland, Scotland, Colonies, &c.		Science and Faith.	Evangelization of Heathen. Methods. Duty of Christian States towards Native races.
The Catholic Church, nature and extent. National Churches, authority and limits.	Biblical Criticism. Grounds of belief in Divine Origin and Authority of Holy Scripture. Growth of Old Testament.	Christian Doctrine in relation to Agnosticism, Indifferentism, Anarchy, and Atheism.	Missionary responsibility Supply and training of Missionaries, &c.
1. National Church: Origin, Growth, Continuity. 2. Welsh Dioceses.	Authority and Credibility of the Old Testament and the New Testament as affected by recent discoveries.	Faith and Science. Fixity of dogma. Progress of Science.	Missions to Jews, Japanese, and Chinese.

[illegible]	EVANGELICAL WORK OF THE CHURCH.—CONTINUED.		EDUCATION.	SOCIAL ECONOMI
CONGRESS, DATE.	HOME MISSIONS.		SCHOOLS, &C.	PRACTICAL.
WAKEFIELD, 1886.	1. Urban population. Recovery of lapsed masses. 2. Rural populations. Weaknesses and Remedies.		Education. Free. Religious teaching in all schools.	Homes of the Working Classes.
WOLVERHAMPTON, 1887.	Adaptation of Spiritual Agencies. Itinerating Missions.	Child life in great cities.		Growth of popula- lation. Migration. Emigration. Colon zation.
MANCHESTER, 1888.	1. Adaptation of the Prayer Book. Creeds. Catechism. Services. 2. Evangelizing Work.	1. Duty of the Church to Seamen. 2. Temperance. Heathen races.	1. Sunday School System. 2. Voluntary Schools, maintenance of. Free? Religious?	
CARDIFF, 1889.	1. Growing Populations: Division of parishes. Mission Rooms. Community life. 2. Linguistic condition of Wales.	1. Missions to Seamen. 2. Spiritual needs of young men. 3. Care of children—Waifs, &c. Work-houses.	1. Voluntary Schools. Religious teaching. 2. Continuation Schools and Inter-mediate Education.	Temporal wellbeing of Working Classes: Housing, Thrift, &c.
HULL, 1890.	Country parishes. Difficulties and Needs.		1. Free Education and its effects. 2. Systematic in-struction in religion in Schools, by literature, &c.	1. Strikes and Wages Disputes. 2. Sanitation. Con-dition of Dwellings. 3. Responsibility of Employers for Spiritual Welfare of Employed.
RHYL, 1891.	1. Church's work in Poorest Quarters, and in Industrial and Mining Districts. 2. Parochial System.		Church Education in Universities and Public Schools, Intermediate and Elementary Schools and Training Colleges.	
FOLKESTONE, 1892.	1. The Church and Agricultural Popu-lations. 2. At Seaside—Residents and Visitors.	1. Duty of Church to Soldiers. 2. Temperance Legislation. Rescue and Prevention work.	Result of the neglect of religious instruction in Elementary Schools.	1. Attitude of Church towards Labour combinations 2. Thrift and the Poor Law. Provision for old age.
BIRMINGHAM, 1893.	Spiritual needs of increasing popu-lations.		Religious Education in Secondary and Public Schools, and in the Home.	1. Mutual duties of Employers and Em-ployed and duty of Clergy to both. 2. Church and the Poor. Housing. Labour Homes. Relief. Thrift.
EXETER. 1894.	Church in Country Districts. Some results. Duty of Church under present conditions of social, etc., life.	1. Soldiers and Sailors. 2. Temperance work and Legislation.	1. Religious instruc-tion. Right of Parents. Confedera-tion. Maintenance. 2. Secondary Educa-tion. Organization of, and Religious teaching. 3. Sunday Schools, &c.	Care of the Poor. Pensions. Housing. Parish relief.
NORWICH, 1895.	Parochial Missions. Universities' and Schools' Missions, &c.	1. Sailors, Fisher-men, and Soldiers. 2. Care of Deaf and Dumb, Waifs and Strays.	1. Religious Education in Elementary Schools. Federation, &c. 2. Nat. Education in England compared with Colonies, &c. 3. Rel. Ed. in Secondary Schools. &c.	[Socialism] Trades Unionism. Co-operation.

a the Table indicate that there was more than one session on kindred subjects.

AND ROBLEMS.	COLLATERAL SUBJECTS.		THE INNER LIFE OF THE CHURCH.	
RECREATIVE.	REUNION.	VARIOUS.	WORSHIP, &C.	DEVOTIONAL MORNING SUBJECTS.
Recreation and Literature.		Parish Churches Bill.	Church Music Cathedrals. Town and Country Churches.	The Devotional Study of Holy Scripture.
		1. Socialism. 2. Women's Work and Influence. (Women only.)	1. Elasticity of Worship. 2. Guilds, Retreats, &c.	The Epistle to the Hebrews.
1. Social Purity. 2. Gambling and Betting.		1. Funeral Reform. and Cremation. 2. Free and Open Churches.		Christian Service. Worship. Almsgiving. Work. Home life.
Popular Amusements associated with Gambling and Betting.	Home Reunion.	Sunday Observance.		The Christian's relationship to (*a*) God. (*b*) The Church. (*c*) The World.
Betting and Gambling.	Home Reunion: Differences. Suggested Schemes.	1. Ethics of Commerce. 2. Socialism.	Due limits of Ritual.	Reverence for (*a*) Name and Power of God. (*b*) God's Holy Day. (*c*) Holy Spirit in Children.
	The Church in relation to Nonconformity. Possibilities of Co-operation.		Church Music, with illustrations in Welsh and English.	Aids to life of Godliness. Prayer. Meditation. Fasting. Almsgiving. Holy Communion.
Physical Recreation, Use and Abuse.		1. Christian Ethics. Individual and Social. 2. Experiments on living animals. 3. Workers, Industrial Condition Temperance. (Women only.)		Christian Doctrine and Christian Life.
	The Church of England in relation to other bodies of Christians. Proposals for Corporate Reunion.	1. The Church and the Press. 2. The Lord's Day Observance. 3. Disposal of Dead.	Church Services. Position of Holy Communion. Symbolism.	The Christian in Home Life. Spiritual Power. Quietness. Proportion. Religion in Social Life.
Ethics of Amusements. Athletics. Field Sports. Theatre, &c. Club life.	[Church of England and Nonconformity (Sub-division.)]	1. Morals and Politics Morals and Commerce 2. Characteristics of Christian Ethics compared with Non-Christian Systems. 3. Work among Women and Girls. (Women only.)	1. Church Worship. (*a*) Art. (*b*) Hymnology. 2. Religious life in the Church: How affected by Party Spirit; how promoted.	The Doctrine and Dispensation of the Holy Spirit.
Social Evils. Impurity. Gambling. (Men only).	1. Hindrances to Christian Unity. Nonconformists. Rome. Eastern Churches. 2. Ditto.	1. The Lord's Day. Sunday Occupation. Opening of Museums. 2. Socialism (sub-div.). 3. Influence of modern life on women (Women only).	Church Music of Purcell's period, illustrated.	The Second Personal Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Preface v
Patrons, President, Vice-Presidents, and List of Committees, &c. .. xviii

TUESDAY, Oct. 8th.

THE MAYOR'S WELCOME TO THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

ADDRESSES:—The Mayor of Norwich (Sir Peter Eade, M.D.) 1
The President 2
Lord Archbishop of York .. 2

SERMONS:—The Lord Archbishop of York 4
The Lord Bishop of Salisbury 14

NONCONFORMIST ADDRESSES:—
Rev. W. A. MacAllan .. 24
Rev. J. H. Shakespeare .. 26
The President 27

INAUGURAL ADDRESS:—
The Right Rev. the President 29

EDUCATION.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPERS:—Canon Daniel 47
Rev. W. R. Finch 52
Canon Scott 55
ADDRESSES:—Canon Nunn .. 59
S. Hoare, Esq., M.P. .. 61
DISCUSSION:—H. Lee Warner, Esq. 64
J. G. Talbot, Esq., M.P. 65
Dean of Norwich 66

THE CHURCH'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS SOCIALISM, TRADES UNIONISM, AND CO-OPERATION.

Chairman—The Right Rev. Bishop Barry.

PAGE

PAPERS:—Rev. M. Kaufmann .. 67
Dean of Ely 72
Rev. C. T. Cruttwell .. 76
ADDRESSES:—Archdeacon Wilson 82
Canon Armour 85
DISCUSSION:—The Chairman .. 88
Dean of Hereford 88
Earl of Stamford 89
H. W. Hill, Esq. 90
The Chairman . .. 90

MISSIONS.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the Bishop of Salisbury.

PAPERS:—Rev. T. I. Madden 91
Canon Eyre 96
Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram 98
Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton 102
A. Giles, Esq. 106
DISCUSSION:—Henry Clark, Esq. 112
Canon Lester 113
Rev. E. C. Hopper .. 114
Rev. Arthur Phillimore .. 114

MISSIONS.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the Bishop of Thetford.

PAPER:—Bishop Blyth 115
ADDRESSES:—The Chairman .. 120
Sir J. H. Kennaway .. 120
Rev. M. Rosenthal .. 122
PAPER:—Rev. George Ensor .. 126
ADDRESS:—Rev. H. J. Foss .. 130
PAPER:—Bishop Moule 132
ADDRESS:—Rev. F. B. Baring-Gould 144

NATIONAL EDUCATION.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the Bishop of Lichfield.

PAGE

PAPERS:—Bishop Barry 146
The Chairman 153
Athelstan Riley, Esq. .. 153
Dr. Noyes 163
ADDRESS:—Rev. R. G. Fowell 173
DISCUSSION:—The Chairman .. 176
E. R. Tuxford, Esq. .. 176
Dr. Noyes 177

SOCIAL EVILS OF THE AGE.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

ADDRESS:—The President .. 177
Mr. Thomas Mason .. 177
Earl of Meath 178
Canon Scott-Holland .. 181
Bishop of Newcastle .. 183

WEDNESDAY, Oct. 9th.

HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Chairman—The Right Rev. Bishop Barry.

PAPERS:—The Chairman .. 184
Rev. Professor Sayce .. 184
T. G. Pinches, Esq. .. 188
ADDRESS:—Sir Charles Warren 194
PAPERS:—F. C. Burkitt, Esq. .. 200
Dr. M. R. James 206
DISCUSSION:—The Chairman .. 211
Rev. J. Leycester Lyne .. 212
Rev. G. H. Harford-Battersby 212
Rev. George Ensor .. 213
The Chairman 214

THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE CHURCH.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPER:—J. Sancroft Holmes, Esq. 215
ADDRESS:—Clare S. Read, Esq. 223
PAPERS:—Dean of Norwich .. 225
Hon. E. P. Thesiger .. 230
Chancellor Blofeld .. 237
ADDRESS:—R. T. Gurdon, Esq. 242
DISCUSSION:—Rev. G. N. Herbert 243
Lord Nelson 245
Chancellor Espin 246
H. J. Torr, Esq. 247
Rev. E. R. Ward 248
Rev. C. F. Blyth 248
The President 249

THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY, DOCTRINE, AND WORSHIP.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAGE

PAPERS:—Professor Robinson .. 251
Rev. F. H. Chase 257
ADDRESS:—Rev. A. C. Headlam 262
PAPER:—Archdeacon Sinclair .. 265
ADDRESS:—Rev. Henry Gee .. 273
DISCUSSION:—The President .. 277
Dean of Chichester .. 277
Dean of Norwich 278
The President 278

EDUCATION.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the Bishop of Lichfield.

PAPERS:—Rev. Dr. Wace .. 280
Rev. Prebendary Meynell 285
Rev. the Hon. E. Lyttelton 290
ADDRESS:—Rev. F. W. Tracy .. 293
DISCUSSION:—Rev. Thos. Field 295
Rev. C. W. A. Brooke .. 296
Rev. Spencer Jones .. 297
Archdeacon Thomas .. 298
Rev. A. Phillimore .. 300
Archdeacon Emery .. 301

FAITH AND SCIENCE.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the Bishop of Peterborough.

PAPERS:—The Chairman 302
Bishop Barry 302
Professor Bonney 308
ADDRESSES:—Rev. C. R. Lloyd Engström 314
Dr. Kinns 318
DISCUSSION:—Rev. J. J. Lias .. 321
Rev. Canon Osborne .. 322
Rev. G. Ensor 323
The Chairman 323

WORKING MEN'S MEETING.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

ADDRESSES:—Chancellor Smith 324
Sydney Gedge, Esq., M.P. 327
W. Mason, Esq. 330
Rev. H. Hensley Henson 333

DUTY OF THE CHURCH.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the Bishop of Lichfield.

PAGE
The Chairman 335
PAPERS:—Canon Scarth 336
Archdeacon Woosnam .. 340
ADDRESSES:—Sir G. Baden Powell 346
Rev. Forbes A. Phillips .. 348
PAPER:—Rev. T. F. Falkner .. 351
ADDRESS:—Rev. J. W. Pickance 357
DISCUSSION:—The Chairman .. 361
Sergeant Mabbs 361
Rev. F. J. P. Jellicoe .. 362

THURSDAY, Oct. 10th.

THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

Chairman—The Right Rev. Bishop Barry.

The Chairman 363
PAPERS:—Canon Jessopp .. 363
Bishop of Peterborough .. 371
The Chairman 375
Bishop Herzog 375
Professor Gwatkin 385
Bishop of Salisbury .. 386
Dr. Porter 390
The Chairman 391

THE NATIONAL CHURCH—*Contd.*

Chairman—The Right Rev. the Bishop of S. Albans.

PAPERS:—Archdeacon Thomas 392
Archdeacon Howell .. 401
Principal Owen 408
ADDRESS:—Canon C. J. Thompson 412
PAPER:—Earl of Selborne .. 416
ADDRESS:—Stanley Leighton, Esq., M.P. 419
DISCUSSION:—Alderman Phillips 421
Rev. J. M. Walker .. 422
Rev. T. C. Collings .. 423
Canon Venables 423
G. F. Chambers, Esq. .. 424
Rev. W. C. Thomas .. 425

HINDRANCES TO CHRISTIAN UNITY.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

The President 427
PAPERS:—Canon Garnier .. 427
Canon Hammond .. 433
ADDRESS:—Rev. H. Sutton .. 438

PAGE
DISCUSSION:—E. R. Tuxford .. 440
Earl Nelson 441
Rev. H. Williams .. 442
Canon McCormick .. 443
Rev. C. R. L. Engström 444
Canon Temple 446
The President 447
PAPERS:—Bishop of Coventry .. 447
Prebendary Meyrick .. 452

HINDRANCES TO CHRISTIAN UNITY *(Continued).*

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPER:—W. J. Birkbeck, Esq. 457
ADDRESSES:—Rev. W. C. G. Lang 464
Rev. H. E. Fox 467
DISCUSSION:—Rev. N. Green Armytage 469
Canon Garratt 470
Rev. W. H. Frere .. 471
Rev. C. T. Cruttwell .. 472
Lord Halifax 473
Dean of Norwich 474
Rev. T. A. Lacey .. 475
Rev. Geo. Everard .. 476
Dr. Allen 477
Rev. E. Denny 478
Rev. A. C. Headlam .. 478
The President 479

WOMEN'S MEETING.

Mrs. Sheepshanks in the Chair.

PAPERS:—Mrs. Sheepshanks .. 480
Miss Wordsworth 482
Hon. Mrs. A. Lyttelton .. 487
Mrs. Challoner Chute .. 491
DISCUSSION:—Miss Anderson-Morshead 497
PAPER:—Miss Yeatman 498
DISCUSSION:—Miss Edith A. Barnett 500

WORKING MEN'S MEETING.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

ADDRESSES:—Dean of Rochester 501
Canon McCormick .. 505
Bishop of Thetford .. 508
Alderman Phillips .. 511
DISCUSSION:—The President .. 516
Mr. Goldsmith 517
Mr. Frank Amies 518
The President .. . 518

CHURCH MUSIC OF PURCELL'S PERIOD.

Chairman—The Mayor of Norwich.

PAGE

ADDRESS:—The Chairman .. 518
PAPER:—Dr. Armes 519
ADDRESS:—Professor Shuttleworth 524

WORKING-WOMEN'S MEETING.

Mrs. Sheepshanks in the Chair.

ADDRESSES:—Mrs. Sheepshanks 529
Miss Blanche Pigott .. 532
Mrs. Creighton 534
Mrs. Sheepshanks .. 537

FRIDAY, Oct. 11th.

DEVOTIONAL MEETING.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPERS:—Archdeacon Perowne 538
Principal Moule .. . 543
Canon Lester 547
Rev. H. W. Hitchcock .. 552
The President 557

THE LORD'S DAY.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

PAPERS:—J. Murray, Esq. .. 560
F. Sherlock, Esq. .. 569
G. F. Chambers, Esq. .. 576
Rev. H. H. Pereira .. 582
The President 587
ADDRESS:—G. Dack, Esq. . 588
DISCUSSION:—H. W. Hill, Esq. 590
Rev. H. H. Henson .. 591
Canon McCormick .. 592
Rev. G. N. Herbert .. 593
Rev. Dr. Peake 593

OUR CATHEDRALS.

Chairman—The Dean of Norwich.

PAPER:—Bishop of Southwark .. 594
ADDRESS:—Canon Donaldson .. 600
PAPER:—Canon Venables .. 602

PAGE

DISCUSSION:—Rev. N. J. Devereux 611
Canon Dundas 612
Samuel Hoare, Esq., M.P. 612
Dr. Pattin 613
Canon Kirby 613
The Chairman 614
Rev. Vincent T. Kirby . 614

THE CHURCH'S CARE OF THE DEAF AND DUMB, AND WAIFS AND STRAYS.

Chairman—Sir Francis Boileau.

PAPER:—Bishop of Barrow-in-Furness 615
ADDRESSES:—Canon M. Owen 619
Dr. Gallaudet 622
DISCUSSION:—Rev. F. W. G. Gilby 623
B. St. John Ackers, Esq. 624
PAPER:—E. de M. Rudolf, Esq. 626
ADDRESS:—Dr. Barnardo .. 631
DISCUSSION:—Rev. A. Downes Shaw 635
Rev. A. Hunt 636
Rev. J. H. Swinstead .. 637
The Chairman 638

WORKING MEN'S MEETING.

Chairman—R. T. Gurdon, Esq.

ADDRESSES:—The Chairman .. 640
The Bishop of Chester 640
Rev. Professor Shuttleworth 644
A. F. Vulliamy, Esq. .. 647
C. F. Claverhouse Graham, Esq. 650
Geo. Abbott, Esq. 656

VOTES OF THANKS.

Chairman—The Right Rev. the President.

ADDRESSES:—S. Hoare, Esq., M.P. 663
The President 663
Bishop of Thetford .. 665
R. C. Gilman, Esq. .. 665
Chancellor Espin 665
Bishop of Southwark .. 666
G. Harwood, Esq., M.P. 666
Dean of Norwich 666
E. P. Monckton, Esq., M.P. 667
Sir Frederic Bateman .. 667
Archdeacon Nevill 668
Archdeacon Emery 668

Church Congress, A.D. 1895.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING.

Patrons:

The Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
The Most Reverend the Lord Archbishop of York.

President:

The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Norwich.

Vice-Presidents:

CLERGY.

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Durham.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Bangor.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chester.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ely.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Exeter.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Hereford.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lichfield.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Lincoln.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Liverpool.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Llandaff.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Newcastle.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Oxford.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Peterborough.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ripon.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of S. Albans.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of S. Asaph.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of S. David's.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Salisbury.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Southwell.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Truro.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Wakefield.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Worcester.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Bedford.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Colchester.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Coventry.
The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Derry.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Guildford, Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Leicester.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Marlborough.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Reading.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Shrewsbury.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Southwark.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Swansea.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Thetford.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of S. Andrew's.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Glasgow.
The Right Rev. Bishop Barry.
The Right Rev. Bishop Hills.
The Right Rev. Bishop Hornby.
The Right Rev. Bishop Macrorie.
The Right Rev. Bishop Mitchinson.
The Right Rev. Bishop Selwyn.
The Right Rev. Bishop Wilkinson.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Norwich.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Ely.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Chichester.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Peterborough.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Wells.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Windsor.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Norwich.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Norfolk.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Suffolk.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Bedford.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Ely *(Permanent Secretary)*.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Huntingdon.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Oakham.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Sudbury.
The Ven. Archdeacon Crosse.
The Rev. the Master of Trinity Coll., Cambridge.
The Rev. the Master of S. John's Coll., Cambridge.
The Rev. the Master of Corpus Christi Coll., Cambridge.
The Rev. the Master of S. Catherine's Coll., Cambridge.
The Rev. the Master of Queen's Coll., Cambridge.
The Rev. Professor Bright, D.D.
The Rev. Professor Gwatkin.
The Rev. Professor Ince, D.D.
The Rev. Professor Kirkpatrick, D.D.
The Rev. Professor Lumby, D.D.
The Rev. Professor Ryle, B.D.
The Rev. Professor Stanton, D.D.
The Rev. Professor Swete, D.D.
The Rev. Chancellor Espin, Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation of York.
The Rev. Chancellor Leeke.
The Rev. Chancellor Lias.
The Rev. Canon Heaviside.
The Rev. Canon Clayton.
The Rev. Sub-Dean Clements.
The Rev. Canon Lowe.
The Rev. Canon Randolph.
The Rev. Prebendary Wace, D.D.
The Rev. Dr. Edghill, Chaplain General.
The Rev. Canon Eden.
The Rev. Canon Hinds Howell.
The Rev. Canon Norgate.
The Rev. Canon Copeman.
The Rev. Canon Garratt.
The Rev. Canon Frere.
The Rev. Canon Du Port.
The Rev. Canon Patteson.
The Rev. Canon Venables.
The Rev. Canon Garnier.
The Rev. Canon Ripley.
The Rev. Canon Tate.
The Rev. Canon Winter.
The Rev. Canon Raven.
The Rev. Canon Nash.
The Rev. Canon Hervey.
The Rev. Canon De Chair.
The Rev. Canon Collett.
The Rev. Canon Owen.
The Rev. Canon Hare.
The Rev. Canon Lawrence.
The Rev. Canon Rowsell.
The Rev. Canon Jessopp, D.D.
The Rev. Canon Beechey.
The Rev. Canon Bulstrode.
The Rev. Canon Eaton.
The Rev. Canon Medley.
The Rev. Canon Mansfield Owen.
The Rev. Prebendary Brereton.
The Rev. Prebendary Meyrick.
The Rev. The Hon. J. Harboard.
The Rev. The Hon. A. Parker.

LAITY.

Norwich, The Right Worshipful the Mayor of (Sir Peter Eade, M.D.)
The Lord Lieutenant of Norfolk.
The Lord Lieutenant of Suffolk.
The High Sheriff of Norfolk.
The High Sheriff of Suffolk.
Winchilsea and Nottingham, The Right Hon. the Earl of
Albemarle, The Right Hon. the Earl of, P.C., K.C.M.G.
Nelson, The Right Hon. the Earl
Stradbroke, The Right Hon. the Earl of, D.L.
Hastings, The Right Hon. Lord
Gwydyr, The Right Hon. Lord, D.L.
Henniker, The Right Hon. Lord
Suffield, The Right Hon. Lord, P.C., K.C.B.
Hamilton, The Right Hon. Lord Claud
Lindley, The Right Hon. Lord Justice, P.C.
Fellowes, The Hon. Ailwyn, M.P.
Lowther, The Right Hon. W., M.P.
Adair, Sir Hugh Ed., Bart.
Beauchamp, Sir Reginald P., Bart., D.L.
Bagge, Sir Alfred Thos., Bart., D.L.
Birkbeck, Sir Edward, Bart., D.L.
Boileau, Sir F. G. M., Bart., D.L.
Buxton, His Excellency Sir T. F., Bart., D.L.
Dalrymple, Sir C., Bart., M.A., M.P., D.L.
Ffolkes, Sir W. H. B., Bart., D.L.
Foster, Sir William, Bart., D.L.
Hare, Sir Ralph, Bart.

Hughes, Sir Alfred, Bart.
Jones, Sir Lawrence, Bart., M.A.
Nugent, Sir E. C., Bart.
Preston, Sir H. J. Bart, M.A.
Stokes, Sir George G., Bart., M.P.
Bateman, Sir F., M.D., LL.D.
Great Yarmouth, The Worshipful the Mayor of
King's Lynn, The Worshipful the Mayor of
Ipswich, The Worshipful the Mayor of
Beccles, The Worshipful the Mayor of
Eye, The Worshipful the Mayor of
Southwold, The Worshipful the Mayor of
Blofeld, The Worshipful Chancellor
Gurney, John Henry, ex-High Sheriff of Norfolk.
Waller, W. Naunton, ex-High Sheriff of Suffolk.
Norwich, The Sheriff of
Pretyman, Captain, R.A., M.P.
Foster, H. S., M.P.
Gurdon, R. T.
Hoare, S., M.A., M.P.
Jebb, Professor, M.P.
Stevenson, F. S., M.P.

Treasurer:

Samuel Hoare, M.P.

Honorary Secretaries:

Archdeacon Nevill.
Canon Ripley.
Canon De Chair.
H. S. Patteson, D.L.
G. F. Buxton.
L. G. Bolingbroke.

Assistant Secretary:

William Heaver.

GENERAL COMMITTEE:

(With power to add to their number.)

CLERGY.

Rural Deans.

Abbay, Rev. R.
Backhouse, Rev. E. B.
Bateman, Rev. J. F.
Beauchamp, Rev. H. W.
Brumell, Rev. E.
Danvers, Rev. G. G.
Ffolkes, Rev. H. E.
Hare, Rev. E. M.
Hoare, Rev. J. Gurney
Hoare, Rev. W. M.
Holloway, Rev. G.
Hooke, Rev. S.
Housecroft, Rev. T.
Jackson, Rev. F.
Lipscomb, Rev. C. H.
Manning, Rev. C. R.
Martin, Rev. W.
Merriman, Rev. G.
Mildmay, Rev. A. G. St. John
Mills, Rev. W. W.
Pooley, Rev. J. G.
Safford, Rev. W. C.
Smith, Rev. Granville
Thornton, Rev. C. C.
Upcher, Rev. A. H.
Upcher, Rev. A. R.
Wace, Rev. A.
Wilfred, Rev. E. R.
Wilkinson, Rev. M. M. U.
Wilson, Rev. T. Holt
Wilson, Rev. W. G.

Allan, Rev. W., D.D.
Allen, Rev. M.
Andrews, Rev. W. H.
Archbold, Rev. T.
Armstrong, Rev. B. J.
Arnold, Rev. H. J. L.
Ballance, Rev. J. D.
Barker, Rev. R. V.
Barrington, Rev. Y. A.
Barry, Rev. R.
Berry, Rev. W.
Bird, Rev. G. J.
Black, Rev. A.
Blyth, Rev. C. F.
Bodington, Rev. H. J.
Brandreth, Rev. H.
Browne, Rev. E. Utten
Burn, Rev. W. Pelham
Callis, Rev. John
Cautley, Rev. R.
Chute, Rev. T. D.
Cleaver, Rev. W. H.
Clowes, Rev. J. H.
Coates, Rev. A.
Cooper, Rev. J. E.
Cowell, Rev. M. B.
Creswell, Rev. S. F., D.D.
Crisford, Rev. A. T.
Davies, Rev. F. C.
Day, Rev. A. G.
Dowell, Rev. E. W.
Duke, Rev. W.
Elwin, Rev. Whitwell
Fawcett, Rev. F. L'Estrange
Fellows, Rev. S.
Fitch, Rev. F.
Floyd, Rev. C. G.
Fowler, Rev. J.
French, Rev. F.
Garnier, Rev. E. S.
Garrick, Rev. J. P.
Garrould, Rev. W. J.
Gawne, Rev. R.
Gedge, Rev. J. D.

Gepp, Rev. N. P.
Gilbard, Rev. E. F.
Girling, Rev. J. C.
Harden, Rev. H.
Harrison, Rev. T.
Hawkins Rev. E. W.
Hodgson, Rev. A. T.
Hudson, Rev. W.
Humphreys, Rev. A. E.
Hunter, Rev. A. J.
Jackson, Rev. J. Stuart
Johnson, Rev. W. Cowper
Johnstone, Rev. C. S.
Kaufmann, Rev. M.
Kennaway, Rev. C. L.
King, Rev. W. S.
Kingsmill, Rev. J. T., D.D.
Lombe, Rev. E. Evans
Long, Rev. E. H. Kellett
Longe, Rev. J.
Lucas, Rev. C. J.
Lucas, Rev. H. H.
Marshall, Rev. R. M.
Morse, Rev. A. S.
Nicholls, Rev. F. H.
Norris, Rev. G.
Ogle, Rev. J. A.
O'Rorke, Rev. H. T.
Parker, Rev. The Hon. A.
Pelham, Rev. John B.
Pelham, Rev. Sidney
Penrice, Rev. C. B.
Pigot, Rev. W. Melville
Proctor, Rev. F.
Ratcliffe, Rev. C. B.
Raven, Rev. B. W.
Raven, Rev. J. H.
Rogers, Rev. J. E.
Scott, Rev. E. M.
Smith, Rev. H.
Smith, Rev. W. E.
Smith, Rev. W. Morley
Spurgeon, Rev. J. N.
Spurgin, Rev. J. F.
Steward, Rev. C. J.
Stillman, Rev. W. B.
Stracey, Rev. W. J.
Sutton, Rev. C.
Walker, Rev. J.
Wells, Rev. H. M.
Whalley, Rev. Pryor B.
Whitmarsh, Rev. R. T.
Whitney, Rev. J. P.
Wilson, Rev. H.
Wilson, Rev. James
Winter, Rev. E. G. A.

LAITY.

Allen, Joseph
Back, Philip
Bates, Frank, Mus.D.
Bensly, W. T., LL.D.
Bignold, E. S.
Bignold, C. A. Bathurst
Birkbeck, W. J.
Blades, F. A.
Burch, F.
Burkitt, W.
Buxton, H. E.
Chamberlin, Alex. R.
Coaks, I. B.
Copeman, A. G.
Copeman, T.
Cowell, C. H.
Crowfoot, W.M., F.R.C.S.
Cubitt, E. G.
Cubitt, Major F. Astley
Cuthbertson, W.
Digby, Commander, R.N.
Dowson, E. Theodore
Edwards, H. W. B.
Ellis, A. M.
Fosbery, E. H.
Freeland, Col.
Frere, J. Tudor
Fryer, W. B.
Furness, T. S.
Garrod, H. E.
Geldart, Robert
Gilbert, Major H. H.
Gilman, Chas. Rackham
Goose, Agas H.
Gorell, R. A.
Gurney, R. H. J.
Hales, J. B. T.
Hansell, Peter E.
Hansell, Walter E.
Harbord, Philip
Harvey, Edward Kerrison
Hartcup, Herbert
Hazard, W. H.
Hemsworth, A. N. C.
Hessey, Major-Gen.
Holmes, E. A.
Holmes, John
Hotblack, F. M.
Howard, Charles
Inman, H. P.
Kemball, C. G.
Keppel, Major
Keppel, T.
La Fontaine, J. S. E.
Lee Warner, Henry, M.A.
Lombe, H. Evans, D.L.
Longe, R. B.
Lucas, C. F.
Martin, Major-Gen.
Martin, Henry J.
Martins, R.
Norgate, C. B. L.
Orde, C. S.
Packard, Edward
Palgrave, R. H. I.
Parker, C. F.
Patteson, H. T. S.
Petre, Bernard
Pettiward, R. J., M.A.
Pomeroy, E. B.
Read, Clare Sewell
Read, G.
Rogers, John, M.A.
Skinner, Col.
Smith, H.
Sparke, E. B., M.A., D.L.
Sparrow, J. W.
Steward, Donald
Tillard, J.
Turner, Walton
Walker, H. B.
Walter, J. H.
Ward, E. F.
Waters, J. Tolver
Welchman, F. R.
Wild, Edward
Winter, J. J.
Worlledge, E. W., M.A.
Young, A. J.

SUBJECTS COMMITTEE:

(*With power to add to their number.*)

CLERGY.

The Very Rev. The Dean of Norwich, *Chairman.*

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Thetford
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Norwich.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Suffolk.
The Ven. Archdeacon Crosse.
The Rev. Chancellor Espin, D.D.
The Rev. Chancellor Leeke.
The Rev. Chancellor Lias.
The Rev. Professor Bright, D.D.
The Rev. Professor Ince, D.D.
The Rev. Professor Kirkpatrick, D.D.

The Rev. Professor Lumby, D.D.
The Rev. Professor Ryle, B.D.
The Rev. Professor Stanton, D.D.
The Rev. Canon Clayton.
The Rev. Canon Randolph.
The Rev. Prebendary Wace, D.D.
The Rev. Dr. Edghill (Chaplain-General)
The Rev. Prebendary Brereton.
The Rev. Prebendary Meyrick.
The Rev. Canon Bulstrode.
The Rev. Canon Collett.
The Rev. Canon Copeman.
The Rev. Canon Du Port.
The Rev. Canon Eaton.
The Rev. Canon Frere.
The Rev. Canon Garnier.
The Rev. Canon Garratt.
The Rev. Canon Hervey.
The Rev. Canon Jessopp, D.D.
The Rev. Canon Lawrence.
The Rev. Canon Patteson.
The Rev. Canon Rowsell.
The Rev. Canon Venables.
The Rev. Canon Winter.
The Rev. Y. A. Barington.
The Rev. J. F. Bateman.
The Rev. J. P. Garrick.
The Rev. W. M, Hoare.
The Rev. W. Hudson.
The Rev. J. T. Kingsmill, D.D.
The Rev. the Hon. A. Parker.
The Rev. Sidney Pelham.
The Rev. C. B. Penrice.
The Rev. F. Procter.
The Rev. J. E. Rogers.
The Rev. A. C. W. Upcher.
The Rev. E. G. A. Winter.

LAITY.

The Right Worshipful the Mayor of Norwich.
The Earl of Stradbroke, D.L.
The Lord Henniker, F.S.A.
Sir F. G. M. Boileau, Bart, D.L.
His Excellency Sir T. F. Buxton, Bart., D.L.
Sir Kenneth Kemp, Bart., M.A.
Sir Edmund Nugent, Bart.
Sir F. Bateman, M.D., LL.D.
The High Sheriff of Norfolk.
The High Sheriff of Suffolk.
The Chancellor of the Diocese.
Allen, Joseph
Bensly, W. T., LL.D.
Birkbeck, W. J.
Buxton, H. E.
Chamberlin, Alex. R.
Cubitt, E. G.
Dowson, E. Theodore
Edwards, H. W. B., D.L.
Gilman, Chas. Rackham
Gorell, R. A.
Gurdon, R. T.
Gurney, John H.
Hansell, Walter E.
Hoare, Samuel, M.A., M.P.
Holmes, J. Sancroft, M.A.
La Fontaine, J. S. E.
Martin, Major-Gen.
Monckton, E. P., M.P.
Packard, Edward
Pettiward, R. J., M.A.
Pretyman, Capt., R.A., M.P.
Read, Clare Sewell.
Sparrow, J. W.
Vulliamy, A. F.
Warner, H. Lee, M.A.
Winter, J. J.
Worlledge, E.

RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

The Right Worshipful the Mayor of Norwich, *Chairman*.

The High Sheriff of Norfolk.
The Sheriff of Norwich.
The Ven. Archdeacon Crosse.
Allen, Joseph
Bagshaw, R. G.
Barclay, H. G.
Barton, Dr.
Bateman, Sir F., M.D., LL.D.
Bensly, W. T., LL.D.
Bignold, C. A. Bathurst
Birbeck, William
Blofeld, Chancellor
Boileau, Sir F. G. M., Bart.
Bullard, Sir Harry, M.P.
Burn, Rev. W. Pelham
Buxton, S. Gurney
Callis, Rev. John
Chamberlin, Alex. R.
Coaks, I. B.
Copeman, Rev. Canon
Davies, Rev. F. C.
Eversley, W. P.
Fletcher, B. E.
Foster, Charles
Gilman, Chas. Rackham
Gurney, J. H.
Hales, J. B. T.
Hansell, Peter E.
Harmer, F. W.
Hartcup, T.
Harvey, Edward Kerrison
Hawes, G. E.
Hinde, C. F.
Hinde, F. P.
Hodgson, Rev. A. T.
Longe, R. B.
Mansel, Colonel
Martin, Henry J.
Orams, E.
Overbury, Walter
Patteson, Rev. Canon
Paul, J. J. D.
Pigot, Rev. W. Melville
Poyser, J. T.
Ranson, J. Farrar
Robinson, Hayes S.
Sewell, P. E.
Steward, D.
Taylor, F. O.
Walter, John Henry
Whalley, Rev. Pryor B.
Wild, E.
Winter, J. J.

FINANCE AND BUILDINGS COMMITTEE.

The Worshipful Chancellor Blofeld, *Chairman.*
Bisshopp, E. F.
Cubitt, Major F. Astley
Gilman, Chas. Rackham
Green, Herbert H.
Hansell, Walter E.
Lacey, Arthur J.
Wild, Edward
Young, Arthur J.

WORKING MEN'S COMMITTEE.

(With power to add to their number.)

Ames, F.
Aldous, W.
Barlow, B.
Beaty, Clement G.
Berry, E.
Brown, F. G.
Burrell, A. J.
Burton, B.
Carman, J.
Chamberlain, H. S.
Chaplin, G.
Cullington, W.
Fisk, John
Gooch, G.
Goldsmith, W. C.
Green, James
Greenfield, W. B.
Hagg, Frederic J.
Harper, G.
Holloway, F.
Howes, W.
Huggins, —
London, T.
Mann, Chas.
Mace, Chas.
Meek, H.
Mirrington, W.
Mitham, Thos. J.
Porrett, J.
Peake, W.
Read, W.
Sent, J.
Smith, F.
Smith, J. H.
Sparkes, B.
Stannard, J.
Thorpe, Benj.
Varley, —
Varden, J.
Vyse, William
Whitworth, H. W.

CHURCH CONGRESS, NORWICH, 1895.

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS.

RECEIPTS.

	£	s.	d.
To 2,525 Members' Tickets at 7s. 6d.	883	15	0
,, 1,631 Day and Platform Tickets at 2s. 6d.	203	17	6
,, 229 Evening Tickets at 1s.....	11	9	0
,, 521 Official Guides at 6d.	13	0	6
,, Advertisements in Official Guide.....	50	0	0
., Donations.....	44	16	3
,, Payment for use of Halls for Special Meetings	28	10	0
	£1,235	8	3

EXPENDITURE.

	£	s.	d.
By Hire of Halls, Lighting, and Attendants	134	11	10
,, Fittings and Decorations	431	18	10
,, Printing and Stationery	166	4	2
,, Postage, Telegrams and Carriage.....	45	18	5
,, Advertisements and Bill Posting.....	176	2	0
,, Clerks, Messengers, &c.....	155	15	0
,, Subsidy to Publishers of Official Report	100	0	0
,, Sundry Payments	24	18	0
	£1,235	8	3

Balance Sheet.

Examined and found correct,

W. H. BIDWELL,

Honorary Auditor.

Nov. 13th, 1895.

GUILD HALL.

TUESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

THE MAYOR'S WELCOME TO THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

The Right Worshipful Sir PETER EADE, M.D., the Mayor of Norwich.

IT is exactly thirty years ago since we had an assemblage of this kind in this city. We also remember that on that occasion, whilst our own Bishop was President, we had also, as we have to-day, the presence of the Lord Archbishop of York, who comes to assist in the important deliberations of this body, and who has undertaken kindly, as the Archbishop of York did on the former occasion, to deliver the sermon which we are about to hear at the cathedral. We know that our preacher is a man of learning and eloquence and earnestness, and I am quite sure that we shall all profit by what we shall hear from him relative to this important gathering. I am sure that Norwich is very glad to receive such an important body as this Church Congress. Norwich considers herself, as we are all proud of saying, the metropolis of this East Anglian district, and we are at all times glad to think that those who constitute such an important section of society as this body should come here to honour us with their presence. I venture to think that it is not uninteresting or inappropriate just to recall the fact that in past times Norwich has, by its ecclesiastical authorities, and by those who have occupied important religious positions in this city, generally exercised a very considerable influence, not only in its own district, but in the history of our country. I am not going to detain you with any lengthened address, but I may just recall the fact that Bishop Losinga, who founded our cathedral—just before the year 1100—1094, I think, was the exact date—was himself, besides being bishop, one of the most important persons in the country at the time, and excercised a great national influence. Then, again, a little later, we had a Bishop Pandulph, who was a very important factor in the turbulent times and conditions which existed then, especially in relation to the King and the ecclesiastical authorities. Then, a little later, 1370 to 1406, we had Bishop Spencer, who himself was not only a great and powerful bishop and a great statesman, but was also known as the soldier-bishop; and he used, I am afraid, many worldly means, not only for putting down his enemies, but for propagating the faith, quite irrespectively of what we understand as the proper spiritual agencies. A little later, we had another great man—Archbishop Parker—who lived in Queen Elizabeth's time, and who, we are proud to think, was a Norwich man born and bred. Later still, we had Bishop Hall, who was intimately connected with the Puritan times. He was displaced during the Puritan reign, and turned out of his house and out of his see. He returned to it when the turbulence of those times had passed. Then, again, passing on for another century or two, we come to Bishop Bathurst, who was a great bishop in this district, and who was remarkable, I believe, for being one of the first English ecclesiastics who advocated, and strongly advocated,

Catholic emancipation. Since that time we have had many learned men, men whose names are fresh in the memory of all of us, partly as learned men, partly as ecclesiastics, and partly as simple men who advocated the doctrines of Christianity with great force and vigour. Among these I may mention such names as Tanner, whose manuscripts are now in the British Museum, and who was a great historian of his time. Then we have had Dean Prideaux, Parr, the great classic, and Bishop Maltby, and Bishop Stanley, and Dean Stanley, the last two of whom were both connected with Norwich, as you know. It is hardly fair to mention those who are still living, but we have very lately had amongst us the learned and most highly esteemed Dean Goulburn, with regard to whom, I think, we may make an exception; and then, last, but not least, I would mention our late revered and lamented bishop, Dr. Pelham, who stands out for his sterling qualities amongst all the names I have mentioned. I have only to say, looking at the Agenda of the Congress, that there are many and most important subjects set down for consideration and discussion—subjects religious, subjects educational, and subjects social. I can only hope that the learning and the power and the knowledge which will be brought into the papers and discussions will be productive of great good. I have no doubt that everything that is said and done will be not only for the benefit of the Church of England, which this Congress specially represents, but that all the deliberations, and all the thoughts and all the words, will be accepted in a broad spirit, and that they will conduce, not only to the benefit of this Church, and of the Church Congress, but to the general welfare of the people of this country. I beg to give my hearty welcome to this Church Congress of 1895.

The Right Rev. the President (JOHN SHEEPSHANKS, M.A., Lord Bishop of Norwich).

I WILL content myself by saying in one sentence how entirely I support everything that the Mayor has said. As the representative of the Church in this diocese, I beg to extend a hearty welcome to our dear brethren, both clergy and laity, who have come from a distance to help in our deliberations, and I am sure that we shall all join together in prayer in a few minutes' time, in our local cathedral, that the blessing of God's Holy Spirit may rest upon the Norwich Church Congress of 1895.

The Most Rev. WM. DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, D.D., Lord Archbishop of York.

MR. MAYOR,—In the name of the visitors to this Church Congress, and on my own part, I give you our most hearty thanks for your kindly words of welcome, and also for the interesting address which you have given us with respect to the previous ecclesiastical history of this important city. It is just thirty years since I last had the pleasure of being here, on the occasion of the former Church Congress to which you have referred. I cannot help remembering a great deal that took place at that time, and on looking back I think I may fairly say that the Church of England has made even more wonderful progress in that period than it had been doing previously to that date. It is one of the indirect benefits of such gatherings as this that they bring the clergy of the Church into closer relations with the citizens of the cities where the Congress is held; and therefore we are all the more indebted to you, sir, as the chief citizen of this city, not only for your words of welcome, but for the kindly preparations which you have made for hospitality towards the members of the Congress. You have alluded in your address to one who presided over the Congress that was held here thirty years ago, and I cannot resist the desire which I have to

say a few words about him. I had the happiness of knowing him, particularly within the last fifteen years of his life; I was brought into frequent communication and intercourse with him, especially at meetings of the bishops of the Church, where many important questions were under discussion; and my recollection of him is that, although he rarely opened his mouth, his words were very weighty when he spoke, and that they were always listened to with the greatest attention, and, I feel sure, with the greatest profit. But beyond that, I remember, and delight to remember, the universal esteem and affection in which your Bishop was held, not only in his own diocese, but over the whole length and breadth of the Church of England. I am sure that his Episcopate must have resulted in very great blessing to the diocese; not only in the ecclesiastical work which he did—and we all know how laboriously he worked, even into far advanced years—but also in the noble example of his private life, which, perhaps, was even more impressive than either the work which he did or the words which he spoke. I am thankful to have had the opportunity of saying this with reference to one whom I deeply honoured and really loved. Now, sir, I must not detain you or this meeting longer, for in a few moments we are due elsewhere; but I must express my own gratification at being allowed once more to be present on an occasion of this kind, for in looking back over the six-and-thirty years (I think) during which this Congress has been in operation, and the first meeting of which I was privileged to be present at, I see such a wonderful growth in the closer relations between clergy and people; in the far deeper interest taken by the laity in Church questions than they took in those days; and if I may say also—and best of all—in the increasing spirit of tolerance with which we have learned to listen to one another, even when our opinions are widely different; that I feel sure that this Congress will be fruitful in the same results as those which have preceded it. I again thank you for giving to the Congress your hearty welcome to the city of Norwich.

THE SERMON

BY

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

(THE MOST REV. WM. DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, D.D.),

PREACHED IN

THE CATHEDRAL, NORWICH,

ON TUESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

"Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, Who is above all, and through all, and in you all."—*Eph.* iv. 3-6.

THESE words of S. Paul speak to us from the epistle for the day. We have heard them this morning as we gathered together for our Holy Communion. They are the message of the Church to her children throughout this week.

The passage is of profound interest, and of fundamental importance. It is the charter of the Church of Christ. S. Paul presents to us a spiritual fact, not an ideal. It is a picture, not a prophecy—the picture of what is, not only what is to be. We are tempted to ask, when will it be attained? S. Paul tells us that it already exists.

Throughout the length and breadth of Christendom, among all its divisions and dissensions, there is one Body. To the eye of our blessed Lord, however obscure to our imperfect vision, the countless multitudes of those who have been baptized into His Name and grafted into Him are bound together in a union, not less real because it is spiritual; they are one body in Christ.

There is one Spirit—the Holy Ghost Himself—by Whom we were all baptized into the one Body.

And there is one hope of our calling—the hope of the heavenly home. Whatever may be our differing conceptions as to the nature of the future life, or the conditions under which it shall be attained, throughout the length and breadth of Christendom there is one hope.

But S. Paul presents to us another group of unities—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.

One Lord; wherever Christians are found, the Christ is worshipped. There may be varied conceptions of His Incarnate life or His atoning death; but everywhere, and at all times, He is the Lord—the Lord of the Church—Head over all things to the Church, which is His Body.

One faith; one in its subject—the revealed truth of God; one in its character, the attitude of believing trust in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.

And there is one baptism. Wherever the Church is found, it is by baptism that its members are admitted. There may be different estimates as to its efficacy or its administration; but among all the divisions of Christendom there is one baptism.

And lastly, the apostle reminds us that all these things are of God. They are not of man's device, they are not of man's operation. They have their source, their strength, and their sufficiency in the one God and Father of all, Who is above all, and through all, and in all.

In this triple trinity—a trinity in unity—we find alike the deep foundations and the vital principles of the Catholic Church.

S. Cyprian has called it the sacrament of unity.

S. Paul speaks of this unity as a unity of the Spirit, a unity created and maintained by the operation of His grace. But though it be of grace, it demands our co-operation—"endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The idea is not so much of guarding the unity as of holding it. It is beyond our power to guard, as it is beyond our power to destroy. We can but rend the garment, in which it finds its manifestation.

S. Paul would say to us:—Realize your own position in the unity of the Spirit; mark and observe it, and have it constantly in your mind. Remember that each one of your fellow-Christians is a member of the same body, and walk with him in the bond of peace.

The subject of the text is not without a passing application to our meeting to-day. The primary purpose of a Church Congress is, no doubt, the discussion of questions concerning the work and the welfare of the Church, questions on which a wide diversity of opinion may probably find very vigorous and decided expression. But there is reason to know that those who initiated these yearly conferences of Churchmen were not a little influenced by the hope—a hope which has found abundant fulfilment—that by means of the frank and honest interchange of conflicting opinion men might learn the better to understand and appreciate each other, and to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

But there is a wider application of the text which you will all anticipate. Reunion is in the air. On every side we hear the cry for unity. A voice from Rome has spoken to us, moved by the same desire, in the letter of the Pope addressed to the English people. It is in many ways remarkable, and in some sense

unique. It breathes from first to last a spirit of fatherly love, and embodies the longing desire of an aged and estimable prelate for the reunion of the divided branches of the Catholic Church. Such a letter is surely to be welcomed, whatever may be its actual value or its ultimate issues. To treat it with silence or with scorn would be unworthy of a Christian people. Nor would it be sufficient for us merely to repeat what has been said and written again and again, that under present conditions reunion is impossible. There is no one of us who does not heartily assent to that statement. It commands the sober concurrence of all thoughtful members of the Church, and the almost passionate assent of the multitude. But it will not do to content ourselves with a *non possumus*, still less with a *non volumus*. It is not enough to sit still with folded hands, even if they are folded in prayer. We cannot forget that the venerable prelate who has thus addressed the people of England is the presiding bishop of one of the most ancient, and certainly the most widely extended, branches of the Catholic Church; a Church which has reared a multitude of saints, and sent forth a noble army of martyrs; a Church which has furnished us with a vast treasury of theological literature; a Church to which in long past centuries, in the time of our weakness and adversity, we were indebted for valuable and loving help.

The letter of the Pope dwells chiefly upon the paramount importance and the power of prayer; and urges upon the people of England the duty of continual and earnest supplication for the restoration of unity. With all this we can heartily sympathize. We may assure the venerable prelate that we too most deeply deplore the divided condition of Christendom; that we too most earnestly desire the restoration of unity in the Church. It will give him happiness to know that the Church of England has never ceased to make this the subject of her continual supplication; that on every day and in every parish our prayers are offered in the words of the Liturgy for "the good estate of the Catholic Church, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life." Still more will he rejoice to know that week by week, and often day by day, there ascends from our altars the beseeching supplication that Almighty God would "inspire the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord;" and still further, that not only individual bishops in their own dioceses, but the representatives of the whole Anglican communion in solemn assembly have appointed special days for united supplication, to plead with God for the speedy fulfilment of the interceding prayers of our Blessed Lord. So far, then, we have anticipated the desires of the Roman Pontiff, and rejoice to find that at least in this we are heartily one with him.

It will be observed that the letter says nothing about the manner in which we may hope for the attainment of these blessings, or the conditions under which the longed-for unity can be accomplished. But we are no longer left in ignorance. The chief minister of the Roman Church resident among us has interpreted in a recent utterance the practical meaning and purpose of the letter. He tells us that, so far as we are concerned, there is only one way in which unity can be restored, and that is by the absolute and unreserved submission of the people of England to the Pope of Rome. He assures us that no other questions of doctrine or discipline need be taken into account. The acknowledgment of the supremacy, *jure divino*, of the Bishop of Rome over all Christians of all nations is the one thing needful—the *articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ.* If we are not ready to accept that claim, then nothing more need be said.

He is wise enough, however, to see that under such conditions reunion is hopeless, and he abandons it in despair. His predecessors were of a more hopeful mind. In their time, a very few years were to be sufficient for bringing back England to the Roman obedience. Now this hope is at an end, and the Cardinal can only look to the gradual process of individual conversions. If we may judge from lamentations recently uttered, that process appears to be very slow indeed. Sometimes it is confessed that there is no progress at all; sometimes that upon the whole there is real loss. But however this may be, there are, no doubt, a certain number of men and women who, in the exercise of their private judgment, have left the Church of their fathers to give themselves to the Roman obedience. There is a class of mind to which the boldness of any claim seems to carry conviction. There are persons, as Coleridge has somewhere said, to whom assertion is the highest form of argument. No doubt they are happier under the Roman system, and we need not grudge them the happiness they have found.

But the Cardinal is certainly right as to any prospect of reunion on the condition which he names. He may rest assured that neither the Church nor the people of England will ever submit themselves to an ecclesiastical despotism, against which for centuries they protested, and which they finally abjured. The claim of Papal supremacy has been investigated by us again and again during the past three hundred years, and as often deliberately rejected. We do not resent it merely as an interference with our spiritual liberty. We firmly believe it to be contrary to the mind and will of Christ. We are ready to give their full weight and significance to the well-known words of our Lord on which this claim is founded. But the history of the Church shows how diversely they have been interpreted. The question is, where the true interpretation is to be found. We look for it in the quarter to which we should naturally turn. We ask in what

sense the words were understood by those in whose presence they were spoken ; those whom the Holy Spirit was to lead into all the truth. We turn to the acts and writings of the Apostles themselves. It may be well for us to recall for a moment the results of such an inquiry. In the record of Apostolic work and Apostolic life, which we owe to S. Luke, S. Peter unquestionably appears as occupying, though not universally, a position of leadership—but without the slightest trace of supremacy, or even authority, over his brother Apostles. We have, on the other hand, in the writings of S. Paul the clearest evidence that he at least did not acknowledge either supremacy or infallibility in his brother Apostle. In none of them is there any hint of such a provision *jure divino*, for the safety and the welfare of the Church of Christ. Even in his pastoral epistles there is no trace of reference to any supreme and infallible guide, to whom the youthful bishops might look for counsel and direction, especially after S. Paul should himself have left them ; and he writes when "the time of his departure was at hand." In the Epistles of S. Peter there is apparently an entire unconsciousness on his own part of his having been placed in an office of such transcendent importance ; and the explanation of this difficulty by Roman Catholic commentators is very remarkable—the Apostle was too modest to advance his claim. It would have been indeed a culpable modesty if, occupying such a position, and holding such powers, he had withheld the knowledge of them from the struggling and suffering Church in his day. Last of all, we turn to S. John, the latest survivor of the Apostolic body, living in a time when heresies had sprung up and oppositions had multiplied, and difficulties of every kind had increased, and anti-Christs were already in the world. We naturally expect to find in his writings some indication, some hint that, amidst all these difficulties, there is a centre of unity and of authority to which the Church might look for infallible guidance at every anxious turn of her chequered career, but from first to last no such hint is found. We ask ourselves, is it conceivable that a matter of such infinite importance should thus have been passed over by every one of those whom Christ had left behind Him as the interpreters of His will ?

If we extend our inquiry into the centuries immediately succeeding the Apostolic age, the results are still the same. S. Paul and S. Peter are everywhere placed on the same level. There is nothing to indicate a supremacy in S. Peter which might not be equally claimed for S. Paul. They thus appear not only in theological writings, but in the earliest works of Christian art. Even late in the third century, S. Cyprian, in his treatise on the unity of the Church, knows nothing of a supremacy of S. Peter, and scarcely even a primacy, and states the case in words of unmistakable meaning. "Certainly," he says, "what Peter was, that also the other Apostles were : endowed with an equal fellowship

both of honour and of power."* To S. Cyprian S. Peter is only the beginning of the Episcopate, not its head. Before the doctrine of supremacy has taken any definite form, it is easy to trace the steps, and to understand the circumstances under which it was evolved, in connection with the capital of the civilized world, the centre of attraction, as well as of authority, for the nations of the earth. We say nothing of the documents used in its support. It is through this stupendous claim that Rome has separated herself from the rest of the Christian world, both in East and West. The differences in doctrine and ritual which exist between her and either the Greek or the Anglican Church are, with some grave exceptions, comparatively unimportant. Many of them are capable of explanation, and many of amendment. But the barrier to reunion lies in the Papal claim. The door is locked against us, and it is locked on the side of Rome.

But, although Rome has spoken, the matter is not at an end. It may be that this utterance does not altogether represent the mind of all Roman Churchmen, nor even of the Pope. Even in Rome men are not all of one mind; nor is she really exempt from the law of change; even in her "the old order changeth, yielding place to new."

The idea of the supremacy itself has greatly varied in character, from the honorary primacy attributed to S. Peter personally in the earliest times, to the absolute dominion and infallibility of the latest of his supposed successors.

The supremacy, as understood by S. Gregory† in the sixth century, or by S. Bernard ‡ in the twelfth, was widely different, and in the case of the latter almost fundamentally different, from the idea which is pressed upon us in the present day. A return to the earlier conception is not beyond the bounds of hope. There are forces at work, moral, intellectual, and, above all, spiritual, with which even popes and cardinals must reckon. The spiritual instincts of Rome are more generous than her definitions, and it may be that in the long run the better instincts will prevail.

The appeal to antiquity may once more make its voice to be heard in the Church of Rome, and it is the very keynote of the Church of England. On this appeal in earlier days Rome took her stand, before it was discarded for development, as development has now given place to infallibility; but even infallibility is apparently losing its ground, as a subtle idea incapable of practical application. It is a flag rather than a force; the

---

* Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis. (S. Cyprian: de Unitate Ecclesiæ.)

† Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se ceteris præponit. (Pope Gregory I.: Epistles, Bk. vii. 33.)

‡ Consideres, ante omnia, sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam, cui Deo auctore præes, Ecclesiarum matrem esse, non dominam; te vero non dominum episcoporum, sed unum ex ipsis. (S. Bernard: de Consideratione, Bk. iv.)

conditions under which it could alone become operative being such as could hardly occur.

On the other hand, no one who observes the signs of the times can fail to see that within the past few months, from many sides, at home and abroad, there have been very remarkable evidences of an increased and definite interest in this momentous question, and a deepened longing for the removal of the great σκάνδαλον of Christendom by the reunion of its separated members. The minds and the hearts of earnest and able men on both sides have been drawn to seek for friendly conference with one another, and this brotherly intercourse has not been in vain. It has unquestionably borne its fruit on the side of Rome in the awakened interest which has been felt and the enquiries which have been made in the matter of the Anglican position. We do not forget that, at previous times, repeated efforts have been made with the same end in view. The record of these movements forms one of the most interesting chapters in the modern history of the Church of Christ. Beginning in the very crisis of the Reformation itself, they have been again and again renewed. From time to time it seemed as if God were stirring the hearts of chosen men to recall to the mind of Christendom the fatal danger of its great disease, and to hold out loving and longing hands to those who on one side or the other were occupying positions of antagonism and mistrust. It is true that no one of these negotiations led to any direct result; but for the most part their failure arose, not from inherent weakness, but from extraneous causes. The names of those who were chief actors in these movements are a sufficient security that they were not undertaken lightly, or by persons incompetent for the task. And doubtless they served their purpose in keeping alive in the Church the remembrance of the pleading prayer of our Blessed Lord, and of our obligation to be workers together for its ultimate fulfilment.

It is beyond our power to forecast the manner in which our Lord's prayer and promise are to be fulfilled.

It is hardly possible to doubt that our Blessed Lord, alike in His prayer and in His promise, intended an organic unity of some kind or other; but there is room for many diverse conceptions of what this unity will be. It may not necessarily involve either identity of theological opinion or uniformity of religious worship. It has been beautifully said that when the hour of reconciliation between Rome and England comes, we shall not yield to them, nor they to us, but both will yield to God. But none the less is it binding upon us as a very urgent duty, one and all of us, to do what we can to further this blessed end. If we shall not see the issue, we may at least prepare the way. No thoughtful man can honestly believe that the present state of Christendom is according to the will of Christ; and no one of us is free from the obligation of striving to make it other than it is, "endeavouring—

giving diligence—to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Yet how little of this serious diligence—this earnest effort—is to be found even among those who daily pray "for the good estate of the Catholic Church." Dr. Döllinger—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—has somewhere urged upon us the necessity of "a personal conviction—that Christ really desires the unity of His Church—that the divisions of Christendom are displeasing to God; and that he who helps to prolong this situation must answer for it to his Lord." But whatever direction our efforts may take, there are certain conditions under which alone progress can be made. First, and above all, our duty is to keep before our minds continually the idea of the Christian Church as presented to us by S. Paul; to believe in the unity of the Spirit; to recognize in every man, and in every body of men, the members of the one body; to look upon them and deal with them as our brethren. And we must look at their best side, not their worst. We must make it our first effort to discover all that is good and true, and all the possibilities of good which lie dormant within them. It is the delight of inferior minds to find fault, to criticize, to condemn; it is the prerogative of the saints to discern all that there is higher and better wherever it may be found. And just in proportion as we recognize the good in others we shall lead them to develop that good in themselves. We must never forget that, however much we may differ from others, there is always something that we may learn from them; and it is through such mutual interchange that union will be restored, far more than by peremptory demands to be followed by ignoble surrender. Whatever may be the purpose of our Lord, as expressed in His prayer, we may feel assured that the unity, when it comes, will not be one of mere external order, but of spiritual affinity and spiritual sympathy. The growth of these will assuredly hasten the day when we all may be one, and when there will be one flock as well as one Shepherd. To build up the structure of unity, we want first of all a common foundation, and surely this alone is the way in which it can be found. If there cannot be among ourselves a unity of religious opinion or of ecclesiastical discipline, there may at least be unity of effort built up on unity of faith, and hope, and love.

There is a saying, oft quoted, of an eminent Roman Catholic Frenchman,* to the effect that "if ever Christians are to approach one another, as everything invites them to do, it appears that the movement ought to proceed from the Church of England." If ever this anticipation is to be realized, we must be fully equipped and prepared for the task. We are apt to forget, while we criticize and condemn the errors and mistakes of others, that we ourselves may not be altogether free from defect. In our discussions and controversies with other religious communions we are tempted to

* Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent, comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l' Eglise de l' Angleterre. (De Maistre: Considerations sur la France, chap. ii.)

think that all the truth is with us and all the error with them. If Rome has erred in some directions, may we not have erred in others? The temptation of our peculiar position is to self-complacency, and to a tacit assumption that we have attained to a final settlement of belief and worship on the basis of the Thirty-nine Articles and the Acts of Uniformity. The time may be approaching when we shall do wisely to review our position as to matters of secondary importance, and to do this in no spirit of faithlessness or fear, but with the earnest desire to rise to the highest level of Christian thought and Christian life in our day. There will be no need to disparage the Reformation, or to think lightly of the splendid protest of the sixteenth century on behalf of spiritual freedom and doctrinal purity. The Reformation was an event unparalleled in its influences upon the moral regeneration of Europe. But, after all, it was initiated and carried on by fallible men; and in the storm and stress of the sixteenth century they may sometimes have mistaken their course, and, perhaps, cast out too hastily some of the precious lading of the ship. It has been recently said by one who is at once philosopher, statesman, and Churchman, that "not every formula which represents even the best theological opinion of its age is therefore fitted to unite men for all time in the furtherance of common religious objects, or in the support of common religious institutions."* And the truth of these remarks is emphasized when, as in the case of our Articles, and in some measure also of our Liturgy, the work of construction was effected under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty, arising from the rival influences of the old leaven and the new. If we are ever to occupy a prominent place in promoting the reunion of Christendom, we must have courage to deliver ourselves from all that is narrow and unnecessarily exclusive, either in our belief or in our practice, else we shall certainly fail.

The present movement may possibly run its course without any immediate or definite result. But the Pope's letter will not be fruitless; it has served at least to re-awaken an interest in the momentous question to which it refers, and to quicken us all in our earnest endeavours after the object which he had in view.

An eminent pope of the seventeenth century declared that his predecessors in the papal chair were responsible for the loss of England. We may well hope that the day will come when another pope may have the glory and honour of reconciling these two great branches of the Catholic Church.

But, apart from Rome, there is no lack of scope for our efforts and our prayers in promoting the reunion of the scattered members of the Body of Christ. The crisis of the Reformation separated us from Rome, but the subsequent course of events has divided us also from the other reformed Churches of

---

* Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour, M.P., "Foundations of Belief," p. 261.

Europe. Is there nothing which can be done to draw together those who shared with us in the great struggle of the sixteenth century, and from whom we were parted only as ships are scattered in a storm?

Above all, with what force and urgency do the words of S. Paul remind us of our most immediate and bounden duty in respect of the separated religious communities in our own country, and at our own doors, whose very existence is a standing hindrance to the keeping of the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace! We cannot for a moment shut our eyes to the piety and the learning of many of the ministers and members of these communities. We cannot, we dare not, forget the earnestness and devotion with which they laboured at a time when, in many quarters, but by no means so generally as is sometimes supposed, the tone of Church life in England was lamentably low; when—to use the striking words of Milton—"The sheep looked up and were not fed." Blessed be God, those days are past and gone; and we may venture to say, in no spirit of proud boasting, but in deep thankfulness and in all humility, that probably at no period of her long history has the Church of England been more earnest or diligent in her ministry than at the present day. But how vastly increased would be her power and influence, if only these her scattered children could once more be gathered within their proper home! Till then, how injurious to the cause of Christ is the present condition of things! It cannot for a moment be doubted that alike in the evangelization of the masses, and perhaps even more in commending the truths of the Gospel to the educated classes of society, the dissensions and divisions of those who bear the name of Christian are a stumbling-block and hindrance, involving the greatest peril to multitudes of souls. And in another direction it is beyond dispute that almost the whole of our present difficulties in the matter of religious education have their origin from the same source. May we not believe that there are some signs around us of better days? Amidst the din and clamour of religious controversy, do we not discern more clearly and more frequently the words of peace? Is there not better hope of mutual recognition—the recognition of the mother by her children, and of the children by their mother; the willingness on their side to give to her the position and the authority which is her due; and on her part to give to them their rightful place within the family home? What may not God have in store for us, if only we be faithful in our efforts and our prayers, endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace? Blessed are the peacemakers. Blessed are they who by word or work, by faithful speech or self-denying silence, are furthering the fulfilment of His heart's desire. "They shall not be ashamed before Him at His coming, they will enter into peace."

THE SERMON

BY

THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY

(THE RIGHT REV. JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D.),

PREACHED IN

S. PETER MANCROFT CHURCH, NORWICH,

ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all the truth: for He shall not speak from Himself; but what things soever He shall hear, these shall He speak: and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify Me: for He shall take of Mine, and shall declare it unto you."—*S. John* xvi. 12, 13, 14. (R.V.)

THE Church of England is sometimes blamed as unwilling, in practice, to accept the truths here enunciated as to the Person and office of the Holy Spirit. It is sometimes alleged that while we profess close and entire allegiance to the words of Christ, we are not prepared to admit their consequences; that we do not believe in the authority of the Church in its present exercise, when it speaks to us in the name of God.

By this censure is perhaps generally meant that we do not accept the teaching of a prominent part of the Church with the same reverence that we give to the whole, and that we reject absolutely the claim of infallibility in matters of faith and morals when it is made on behalf of a single bishop. In reply to such criticism, of course, our defence is easy.

There are, however, other and subtler tendencies to ignore or deny the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church, against which it behoves us to be on our guard. Unfriendly criticism may be helpful if it is taken in the right temper; and there is, I fear, a certain sense in which this criticism is often true.

There are in fact two directions in which we may really be unwilling to accept the truth as to the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church to-day—(1) We may limit too severely the teaching of the Holy Spirit to the letter of the Bible, and

imagine Him to be absent from other forms of Church doctrine or discipline than those which are to be found exactly in Scripture. (2) We may make no count of His presence except in the comparatively few cases where the whole Church is at one.

It is, of course, true that there are two fortresses, an inner and an outer one, which crown the whole hill on which the city of God is built, just as they do our ancient site of old Sarum standing above the valley of the Avon. In the centre is the citadel of the Bible; round about it is the circle of the undivided Church. Here is the fulness of the Holy Spirit's power; but His grace descends to all the lower levels and regions on which the different local and national Churches rest. What He teaches them severally is in one way less important, but in another more. It is not absolute and universal, but it is more direct and personal. It is less important for the whole, but of greater moment to the part; and yet even to the whole it is eventually of the greatest importance, for it trains and dignifies the part, so that it may contribute its proper elements to the higher life of the whole. The Church is a body not possessed of chemical or mechanical unity, but of a living oneness. It is a union, not of atoms, but of forces, functions, and powers. Or, to take another metaphor, it is a union like that of man and woman in marriage. They may be trained apart from one another, and possibly in long ignorance of one another. Their experiences may have been very diverse, and their powers and habits very dissimilar. But if their marriage is a true one, when it comes in God's good time, they find that they have been prepared for the union, and by the very separateness of their training have elements of strength to give, for mutual support, and complementary balance, which are essential to their after stability and progress in the Christian life.

Again, it is not only in different regions of the holy city, either central, or, so to speak, suburban, but in different ways, some more tangible and some less, that the Holy Spirit's blessed presence is felt. The new Jerusalem has its air and light diffused about it and its streams of running water, as well as its foundations and its walls, its gates and its streets. There is, indeed, an indispensable power in its organization and in its formal expressions of opinion, its directions and its judgments, its creeds and its councils, and the like. But there is also a manifestation of the Spirit in the general sense and current of Christian opinion, in the circulation of feeling, in the impalpable but bracing atmosphere of Christian morals, which in some ages is of greater power than canons and decrees of councils would be.

The words of the Lord do not in fact seem to limit the power and office of the Holy Spirit to any particular age of history, or to any one or two methods of teaching. The real limit which He lays down, the test which He suggests to us to apply, is that of conformity to His own will already made known to us. This

is expressed at least three times in these wonderful chapters speaking of the Spirit's office:—John xiv. 26, "He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you;" John xv. 26, "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall bear witness of Me;" and in our text, John xvi. 14, "He shall glorify Me: for He shall take of Mine, and shall declare it unto you."

We are in fact bound to try all who profess to speak in the power of the Holy Spirit, not merely by the great test whether they accept the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, as S. John in his Epistles teaches us to do; but whether their message agrees in detail with His. Is it a true inference from and a true development of it, or are alien elements, heathen or Jewish, mixed in it? And, again, is He the subject of their message, or is it some human invention, some other mediator, some fresh Gospel?

But, bearing these cautions in mind, we may gladly seize on these great promises as investing what is round us with light and joy, as filling the atmosphere of our Church life with a freshness and glory not of earth. We learn not only to profess belief, but actually to believe that the Holy Spirit has a continuous plan and work in His dealings with our Church, and with ourselves individually, and that His action is not merely that of a Teacher in a Book, or of a Judge in a Council, but that of the text. The Lord's word is ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς, "He shall guide your journey." He is a patient, perpetual companion, carrying us along through paths and ways which do not at once seem plain to our understanding, but which conduct us bit by bit into what at last we shall recognize to be "all the truth."

We may, then, well ask ourselves, on a day like this, what are the principal elements of the truth which the Holy Spirit is teaching and has taught us members of the Church of England, as distinguished from other portions and branches of the Universal Church? This is a wide question, to which you will not expect me to attempt to give a complete answer. You will answer it for yourselves perhaps in somewhat different ways. Let me, however, attempt to sum up in a few words, as desiring to represent your general and sober judgment, the chief positive as opposed to negative teachings which we have to develop as our characteristic contribution to the good of the whole Church. I do not undervalue the negative teachings, the casting off of certain dominant prejudices and tyrannical ideas. But these are not the essence of truth, only the conditions precedent to its attainment. It has been well said indeed that the Reformation tended too much to make men controversialists, that it stopped the natural and proper development of theology. It was necessary, I think, that it should do so for a time. But we ought gradually to rise out of that condition, and the first step is to

look to the positive rather than the negative side of what we have learnt in our more or less isolated position.

I.—First of all, we should, I suppose, place what Archbishop Parker calls in one of his letters* by the quaint term of "reverent mediocrity," and what later theologians used to call "the *Via Media*"—that is, the attempt to combine the good of each of the two extremes, authority and freedom, and to do this in a careful, moderate, temperate, quiet fashion, without giving offence and without claiming infallibility, or absolutely condemning and anathematizing others. Essayists of various sorts and degrees are constantly criticizing this position as wanting in logic, as not thorough-going, as not grand or ideal. They wish the Church of England to be all Catholic or all Protestant. They wish to be able to label it and put it into a dictionary of sects; and there is a danger lest many young people, who very properly desire to have their minds clear, or older people who are beginning to feel that life is short, and so become, as the ancient moralist describes them, "greedy of the future," should be carried away by these futile criticisms and be ready to surrender the inheritance which has been handed down to us from our fathers. But those who come to gatherings like this have generally learnt that a comprehensiveness which is above logic—that is, which cannot be exactly defined and formulated—has great, manifest, and abundant blessings.

II.—The next great characteristic of the Church of England is her high ideal of life for the laity—and this is what I wish to impress specially upon my hearers to-day.

It would, no doubt, be possible to trace the antecedents of the efforts made at the Reformation and since in this direction, and it would be an excellent subject for the Church historian. We are learning that the records of protests and conflicts, of heresies and schisms, of persecutions and martyrdoms, though necessary and moving elements of history, do not make the real staple of history. They are but the culminating points of a long series of more secret thoughts and quieter efforts, which are often much more important than their final manifestations.

One of these antecedents was no doubt the emphasis laid on the rite of confirmation in this country in early times. It is a happiness to me to reflect that the founder of our city and cathedral at Salisbury, Bishop Richard Poore, had a principal share in creating this feeling, though in his days confirmation was administered to young children under seven years of age. Before the end of the thirteenth century the rule was enacted, which is still that of our Church, though not, as far as I am aware, of any other portion of Western Christendom, that no one

---

* "Correspondence of Archbishop Parker," No. 164. Ed. Parker Society, p. 215. For "mediocrity" of course we should now say "moderation."

shall usually be admitted to Holy Communion who has not been confirmed. Hence at the time of the Reformation both bishops and people attached more weight to it, and though often administered carelessly, it was retained as a necessary part of Church discipline, and has become gradually one of the greatest instruments of religious education that any Church in Christendom possesses.

To us in this day it appears as of special value, as the proper safeguard and defence of infant baptism, and as the consecration of the laity to their share in the royal priesthood of their Master, the first step in holy orders. If we may sometimes regret that we have lost or obscured the ancient outward symbols of anointing with chrism and sealing with the sign of the Cross, we have retained what some other Churches have entirely or practically lost, the one Apostolic and primitive sign of imposition of hands, which connects it so clearly with ordination. We have thus, by the very simplicity of the service, given it a kind of dignity which it has neither in the East or the West; and by reserving it, with the Latin Church, to Bishops—instead of handing it over to presbyters, as is done in the East and among the Lutherans—we have in another way established it as a very solemn office, while we have drawn our bishops into a great deal of pastoral visitation and personal interest in their flocks which they would otherwise have lost. The later age at which it is generally administered among us is also another point of dignity, which is not to be lightly esteemed or readily surrendered.

This importance given to confirmation, which has thus been gradually developed in the Church of England, is one of the teachings and guidings of the Holy Spirit for which we ought most to be thankful. It falls in with much that is implied in the Prayer-book in regard to the high position of the laity in other things. According to the system of our Church, the daily services, which before the Reformation were practically confined to the clergy or to persons under some special vows or religious profession, have become the natural and fitting devotions also of the laity. "The curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel" is instructed to say daily morning prayer and evening prayer in the church or chapel where he ministereth, and "to cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin that the people may come to hear God's Word and to pray with him." I doubt not that there are many here to whom this duty is a happy and blessed reality, but I do not feel sure that their number is increasing, or that the value of the order is as well understood by Churchmen of this generation as it was thirty years ago. I fear it must be said that the prominence given to the Holy Eucharist and to Eucharistic worship, and the distinction drawn between such worship and edification, though it is a natural, and in many respects a proper, reaction from old

neglect, is by no means wholly free from danger. In fact, it is forgotten that by the shortening of the lections from Scripture which has taken place in the Communion Office since primitive times, and the diminution in their number, as well as by the frequent modern practice of omitting the sermon, that Office has ceased to be, by itself, such an instrument of edification as it was in the earliest ages, and was intended to be in our own Church. It is, therefore, extremely painful to hear matins and evensong spoken of in slighting terms, and treated as if they were mere forms to be hurried through ; to hear of clergy teaching that the public absolutions of the Church, even in the Communion Office, are of little or no value compared with that which follows private confession ; and to have "attendance" at Holy Communion, which sometimes tends to be of a very passive and dreamy kind, exalted as if it were a far higher duty than the participation in the daily offices. These are habits of thought which ought to be jealously watched by those who value the true position of the laity in our Church, and the stability and masculine sobriety of our religious temper.

Then as to Communion itself—the tendency of the Church of England has been to make it much more frequent for the people than it is in other Churches. Before the Reformation, only very pious persons communicated except at Easter, and this is still the general rule, I suppose, both in the Latin Church and amongst the Greeks. Communion is unfrequent, too, generally, amongst Presbyterians, Lutherans, and Calvinists. Our rule that the priest shall not celebrate the Holy Communion except when four, or three at the least, are ready to communicate with him, was clearly intended to promote the practice of frequent Communion, and to teach the people that they had a full share in this great mystery, and to help them to realize their part in the Christian priesthood. On these grounds, therefore, it ought to be generally observed. I know it sometimes presses hardly on the clergy ; and laymen should remember that it does so. If we clergy depend upon you for our spiritual privileges, it is because you profess to belong to the Lord's Body, and are taught by your Church to desire to show yourselves worthy of your high ministry, as good stewards with ourselves of the manifold grace of God. It is a sad thing for a bishop to have to say to a clergyman who has been all his life accustomed to weekly Communion, "You must deny yourself, unless you can persuade your parishioners to join with you ;" but such is clearly the rule of the Prayer-book, and only special circumstances can justify dispensation from its observance.

Another striking example of the high ideal set before our lay people is the special privilege which they have when sick of having the Eucharist consecrated in their own homes and by their bedsides. This was strongly objected to by the Puritans.

It is equally contrary to Roman usage. It is an especially Anglican custom, which ought not to be undermined by those who desire reservation of the sacrament—a practice certainly primitive, but as certainly shown by experience to be exposed to some dangers which it is very difficult to guard against.

III.—A third evident teaching and guiding of the Holy Spirit among us has been to bring our Church to declare as far as possible "the whole counsel of God," and to serve Him with mind and strength, as well as with heart and soul. The two main lines of guidance which He has followed have been, first, the bringing the great Church seasons into special prominence by the simplifying of ceremonies and the disuse of many festivals and saints' days of minor importance, and, secondly, by the public reading of Scripture and recitation of the Psalter. In regard to the first, probably some of us would wish that some things had been retained which have been lost, or more opportunity given for development. Probably it would have been a happy thing if the day of the Lord's Transfiguration had been kept up as an important festival, and it would be desirable that we had, at least in our calendar, one or more days commemorating the typical or so-called "patron" saints of each Christian nation or country For instance, S. Patrick and S. Ninian deserve a place there as well as S. David. But these are minor blemishes compared with the great advantage of having proper time and thought given to the surpassing glories of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension tide, Pentecost, and Trinity, and the great penitential and meditative seasons of Lent and Advent.

The second line of teaching, by the recitation of the Psalter every month, and the reading through of nearly the whole Old Testament Canon and part of the Apocrypha once a year, and of the New Testament twice, cannot be missed by any English Churchman. It is a blessed thing to think that in many households and in many quiet sick-rooms "reading the Psalms and Lessons" is kept up where attendance at the daily offices is not possible. I trust it is not dying out in this generation, with its eagerness for novel methods. If Holy Scripture is a revelation given for all time to the Church for her instruction, we cannot properly serve God with our minds, or declare His whole counsel to others, unless we try to learn from all parts of it. I am not one of those who take a very unhappy or unfriendly view of the modern criticism of the Old Testament, incomplete, strained, and unsatisfying, as a large part of it appears to me to be, but I do from the bottom of my heart detest and reprobate the tendency to undervalue the moral and spiritual teaching of the Old Testament, and to give up reading it with reverence and awe, which I fear is now not uncommon. If any one here is tempted to do so, let him remember S. Paul's language to Timothy, who was bred up on the Old Testament,

and even more our Lord's great utterances, "The Scripture cannot be broken," and of Moses, "He wrote of Me," and the rest. Let him read, as one of the best of modern books on this subject, Dean Church's "Discipline of the Christian Character," which, without being apologetic in form, is practically an excellent defence of our traditional reverence for the ancient Scriptures.

I do not hesitate to say that anyone who attempted to construct a system of religion and morals out of the New Testament, apart from the Old, would be doomed to inevitable failure, and that, too, in regard to many of the strongest and most fundamental parts of the Christian character.

IV.—Lastly, if I may address one word to my brethren of the clergy who may be present, I would say, "Do not be dismayed by those who attack the English Ordinal, because it does not speak in definite terms of our office as having the right to offer the spiritual sacrifices of the Church." The object of our reformers was, as the preface to the Ordinal distinctly states, to continue the existing ministry as it was from the Apostles' times. When, therefore, the bishop prays, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God," he is speaking for the Church of all ages, and of that conception of the priesthood which belongs to the whole Catholic Church, in which the priesthood stands to represent man to God as well as God to man. But in the questions which are addressed to us at our ordination, the Church very properly emphasizes more particularly and explicitly the other side which is so easily forgotten, the not less solemn and awful side, nay, perhaps, the more awful, the representation of God to man as His messengers, watchmen, and stewards, as ministers of the doctrine, sacraments, and discipline of Christ, as pastors and teachers and examples to the flock. This is Christ's great charge to Peter; this re-echoes His last words to the Apostles; this is S. Peter's own conception of the ministry (1 Pet. v. 1-4); this is S. Paul's personal teaching to the elders of Ephesus, and his written instruction to the Churches of that city and its neighbourhood in his most spiritual and profound Epistle (Eph. iv. 11-13). This, too, is the general sense and import of the most ancient forms of ordination, which either pass over, or only indirectly refer to, the power of offering the Eucharistic sacrifice.* I would say to my brethren of the clergy, "Is not this a sufficiently high ideal for us? Is it not a guiding of the Holy Spirit that it is so fully set forth by our mother Church?"

Let us not be troubled by what is not so clearly stated, but

---

* I am glad to find this topic well treated in an introduction to the "Articles of the Church of England," by Dr. G. F. Maclear and Rev. W. W. Williams, pp. 402, fol. (London, 1895)—a book which will doubtless have, as it deserves, a large circulation. I may also refer to my *De Validitate ordinum Anglicanorum*, pp. 18, fol. (Longmans 1894.)

let us practise what is the main purpose of our Ordinal to bring out. It is clear that it has been followed by one great blessing—namely, that the clergy of our Church have, perhaps, above all others, a free entrance into the houses of rich and poor alike, and are expected especially in the sick-room without being sent for. To whom is this due? It must be, I think, in great measure, to the much underrated clergy of the eighteenth century, who had succeeded the sad break of the civil wars, and had to build up spiritual life simply on the Prayer-book.

In conclusion, I would say to all who come to this Congress, remember that you are English Churchmen, and thank God for making you so. We may want some things that others have. We may want some of the religious independence and personal dignity of the better sort of Scotchmen; we may not be so warm-hearted or so easily disciplined, perhaps, as some other nations; we may not take as great interest in local self-government as we ought to do, either in Church or State; but we have something none the less that the Holy Spirit has taught us, which we ought to contribute to the general life of the Church. Many things will be tried, nay, are being tried, which are not likely, to say the least, to prove successful in restoring and building up spiritual life. False and dangerous developments in ritual, such as the Roman service of Benediction with the reserved Sacrament, and the invocation or cultus of the saints, these are not true means of serving God or helping men. They do not agree with anything we can "remember" of the teaching of Christ. Nor, again, can we see any sure evidence of the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the hurrying anxiety of some of our clergy to provide amusements for the people, or to agitate for social reforms by semi-political methods, or to force everything into a democratic model, as if popular election was a proved instrument of always securing the readiness of the most competent men to be made representatives. They are in some cases methods of expediency, necessary perhaps for the present distress, but they must not take up too much time, or distract us from our true work.

The Church is a great educational society to build up the souls of those who have been won to God. That, rather than the provision of amusement, or the leadership of crusades for social reform, or brilliant spectacular worship, is its true function.

It is in the home, the school, the church, in the house of business, the farm, the workshop, that we must chiefly look to carry out our Lord's great design. These are the places where English character has been moulded specially in the past, and will be moulded in the future. Let us teach our people that as Churchmen they must strive to unite all that is good in religion within the nation; that as confirmed Churchmen they have a special priestly character to uphold and develop in the family,

and in the organization and discipline of labour. Let us remind our clergy that they are especially called to be pastors and teachers, and have to thank God for special access to the hearts and homes of their people. If the question were asked, What are the two things which appear to be our manifest call at this moment as Englishmen and Churchmen, to show to the world as the result of the Holy Spirit's work among us? I should venture to say, first, the revival of religion within the family; and, secondly, the restoration of honesty in daily life outside it. If it were further asked, What are the great needs of our modern clergy? I would say steady teaching in the school, steady visiting the sick and the whole, steady preparation of thoughtful sermons. We have the habits and the conditions for all these things: they are natural and beautiful fruit of much special discipline of God towards our nation; but if we are not steady in their pursuit, more flashy and brilliant ideals may readily take their place, and leave us poor and unprepared, when a great breaking up of old antagonisms comes, either in this world or in the world to come, and the nations are called to work together in the light of the holy city, and the kings of the earth to bring their true honour and glory into it.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS,

HELD AT NORWICH.

AGRICULTURAL HALL,

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

The PRESIDENT (The Right Rev. JOHN SHEEPSHANKS, M.A.)

TOOK his seat in the Congress Hall at 2 p.m. After prayers and a hymn, the President said—Let us now rehearse the Articles of our holy faith. The Apostles' Creed was then recited by the Congress. Then followed the presentation of the

NONCONFORMIST ADDRESS,

which was read by

The Rev. W. A. MACALLAN (Presbyterian Minister).

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP, THE PRESIDENT, AND THE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH CONGRESS, ASSEMBLED IN NORWICH, OCTOBER, 1895.—We, the ministers of the Free Evangelical Churches of Norwich, desire to offer to the members of the Church Congress a cordial and respectful welcome on this the second occasion of their meeting in this ancient and historic city, the chief city of a diocese made memorable in the history of the Church of England by the episcopate of Bishop Stanley, and later by Bishop Pelham, both of whom lived and died surrounded by the reverence and love of all good men of every Church.

We greet you, dear brethren, as fellow-members of the one mystical Body of Christ, and we rejoice that in every age, both among the clergy and the laity, you have numbered so many who have exhibited to the Church and the world the true ideal of the saintly life. We thankfully acknowledge the ever-deepening obligation under which you have laid us, and not us alone, but all members of the one Catholic Church of Christ through the writings of your great theologians and scholars, and through the long succession of eloquent and faithful preachers who have discovered and disclosed the hidden treasures of the Word of God, and applied that Word to the consciences and hearts of the English nation. We give God the praise for the valuable part you are playing in the solution of the pressing social questions of our time, for your ministry to the poor, the sick, and the outcast, and for splendid service in the Colonies and the most distant parts of our empire. You have aroused the deepest emotions and enthusiasms of the Christian heart by the energy and devotion of your missionary work, and through the great company of men and women of your communion who have not counted their lives dear to them for the name of the Lord Jesus, some of whom have been numbered, even during the past few weeks, among the noble army of martyrs. We praise our God for the munificent contributions

which your Church has received, both for regular and aggressive work, from the wealth and abundance of the rich and from the self-denial and offerings of your poorer members.

Whilst we desire thankfully to acknowledge all God has done for you and by you, we have no desire to conceal or to minimize the great and serious differences which separate us, and which still keep us in separate and distinct ecclesiastical communities. The unity of the Church for which our Lord prayed on the eve of His passion and death can never be secured at the expense of truth. We are fully aware that a large and powerful section of your Church hold both conscientiously and tenaciously the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, which makes it impossible for them to recognize the validity of ministerial orders which have not been conferred by Episcopal ordination. If, however, we have no desire in a spurious and unwise charity to deny the serious ecclesiastical differences which thus separate us, we have still less the desire to magnify these differences, or to forget that, serious as they are, they do not affect the common claim we make with you to be members of the one invisible Church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We are one with you in all the great articles of the "faith which was once delivered unto the saints." With unfeigned assent and consent we rehearse with you the ancient Apostles' Creed. We have enriched our services by many of the hymns which your children have sung, just as you have not refused admission to your service of praise to some of the noblest hymns of the Nonconformist communion. We gratefully acknowledge many indications that a larger charity, a juster and more generous appreciation of each other, and a kindlier and more Christian feeling are slowly, but surely, sweetening and elevating the relations which subsist between us and you, and we appreciate to the full the spirit of the overtures for reunion which were made by the distinguished assembly of your Archbishops and Bishops at the Lambeth Conference.

Whether, indeed, the time will ever come when all the sundered Churches of Christ shall be reunited in one outward and visible Church, and there shall be one flock as there is but one Shepherd of the flock, we will not presume to say. The future is in the hands of God, but meanwhile it must be the responsibility of each of us faithfully to preserve in all its sanctity and entirety the "deposit" of faith committed by our Lord to His people, and to continue in prayer and labour for the salvation of souls and for the coming of Christ's kingdom amongst men.

We pray that the blessing of God may so abundantly rest on all your deliberations that this city shall not only receive from your coming a quickened spiritual impulse, but that all the Churches of Jesus Christ in this land, and your own Church above all, shall be filled with all the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ.

We are yours in the bonds of Christian Brotherhood,

G. S. BARRETT,
W. A. MACALLAN,
J. H. SHAKESPEARE,
FRANCIS C. FRANCE,
GAD PRING,
WILLIAM RUTHVEN,
THOMAS BULLIMORE,
JOHN LEWIS,
HENRY STARMER,
T. BRIGHT,
J. FULTON,
C. H. BUXTON,
WALTER D. HAYWARD,
JAMES H. ROSE,
GEORGE E. STONE,
GEORGE TAYLOR,
C. MORGAN,
J. DAGGETT RAINFORTH,
R. W. LITTLE,
ALFRED BARRETT,
R. C. RODWELL,
GEORGE PLUMB,
H. YOULDEN,
ALFRED JONES.

The Rev. J. H. SHAKESPEARE (Baptist Minister).

WHEN it was first proposed to present our address of welcome—a proposal which the Bishop of the diocese responded to in most kind and courteous terms—we hoped to be represented by Dr. Barrett. He holds a universally conceded leadership among us by right both of his long connection with Norwich and of his distinguished ability and character. Yet, however imperfectly I may speak for my brethren, I am charged to express their deep sense of the immense interest and importance of your deliberations, and of the honour your visit confers upon this city. If we were simply yielding to the desire to say pleasant and generous words, it would be laudable enough during this week when so many of us meet at the same table, kneel at the same altar, and discover that the realm of sympathy is so much wider than we thought. But we count it our privilege to stand here to-day and to declare that we should be unworthy of the name of Englishmen if we were not proud of the greatness, the influence, and the achievements of the English Church. We recall with gratitude our own debt to you, for the thoughts of your great preachers and teachers have entered like iron into our blood, and have coloured and inspired our whole ministry. It is your inalienable glory that generation after generation you have maintained the unfailing use of common prayer and the regular reading of the Word of God. In a secular age you have offered a persistent witness to the best things—your aims have been not only national, but also imperial. Your expansion has been commensurate with the expansion of England, and while pessimists lament and sceptics boast the spread of materialism and the decay of religion, you have repeated the sacrifices of the most heroic days, and in the prodigality of your resources have gone out to conquer new worlds and to win new realms for Christ. You have had the sagacity to perceive and the energy to grapple with the changed conditions of population and the rapid growth of the towns, and there is no suburb in England in which the spire does not rise as the symbol of your awakened zeal and profound statesmanship. These are among the thoughts which surge through our minds to-day, but it is inevitable that there should be others also of which it is not less right to speak. The problem of the continued separation between the Anglican Church and Nonconformity was never more living and immediate than it is at present. It is discussed in every journal, on every platform, and from every conceivable point of view. It is translated into conduct and attitude every day of the week in every parish and village, in every vicarage and chapel manse throughout the land. We cannot doubt that a new spirit is abroad, a weariness of strife and turmoil, and of yearning for Christian fellowship. Perhaps we most of us begin life with a kind of unholy pugnacity. We imagine that the wars of Israel are to be our model, and we long for an ecclesiastical fray. But as we grow older we learn more of the value and beauty of peace. As it is with individuals, so is it with institutions and Churches. The spirit of peace comes upon them too, not an indifference to the truth, but a very solemn feeling that division must mean mutual loss, and that in this great warfare "he that is not against us is for us." Now the question of separation is first of all historic; its original causes are fixed and unalterable. We may debate them academically, but we cannot change them. But on the other hand, the continuance of Nonconformity is always a modern problem. It wears a new aspect in every generation. It must never be taken for granted, but must be discussed upon its merits from time to time. I for one am not prepared to admit that our differences are final and hopeless.

Of course, human nature being what it is, so long as conformity is required there will be Nonconformity; but the strength of Nonconformity, its importance, and whether it will attract earnest, intelligent, and godly men, will always depend on that to which they are required to conform. It is therefore vital that we should see clearly

the essence of the situation. Whenever proposals of reunion are made, a crowd of prejudiced and heated partisans at once fasten on some minor point, and nail their colours to what they call the mast, but which is only one of the ship's spars. They divert attention from that which is fundamental. In one of Addison's charming essays he relates how Sir Roger de Coverley, when a schoolboy, had occasion to inquire the way to S. Anne's Lane, upon which the person whom he spoke to, instead of answering his question, called him a Popish cur, and demanded who made Anne a saint. The boy in confusion asked the next he met which was the way to Anne's Lane, but was called a prick-eared cur, and told that Anne was a saint before he was born, and would be when he was hanged. Upon which the frightened youth went into every lane in the neighbourhood and asked what they called the name of that lane. So it is in ecclesiastical questions; there is such a Babel of voices raised in anger about trifles and non-essentials, that real issues are obscured, and quiet people are afraid to hear themselves speak. It may be, dear and honoured brethren in Christ, that you are not prepared to re-open the chief questions between us which were peremptorily closed more than two centuries ago. It may be that as you read your loyalty to Christ you cannot acknowledge our ministry and our Church life. If this be so, the question of organic reunion is indeed an insoluble one. Much as we covet your fellowship, we must elect to stand by our spiritual ancestry. We cannot come to you, nor would you wish it, unless we bring with us our consciences and our honour. You may win certain accessions, but our best elements—those elements which mean the practical reunion of English Christianity, our Spurgeons, Dales, and Maclarens—must remain for ever in separation. Perchance, in the inscrutable providence of God, it is designed that we should realize our unity in another way. Perhaps we are to find that the "dearest bond of love" is not "like to like, but like in difference."

Meanwhile, let us cultivate in our various spheres a temper of courtesy and nobility, and a mutual recognition of the best motives and the sincerest purposes. Let us in our pulpits abjure those words which leave lasting scars and arouse the baser passions of man. Whether we are conscious of it or no, the realities which unite us infinitely transcend our differences, grave and serious as they are, since we have one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all. The Church is not only a society with common professions and ceremonials, but also "an organization charged with a great practical work." We may stand shoulder to shoulder in resisting all that would weaken the sanctions of morality, or desecrate the Christian Sabbath, or lessen the authority of Scripture, or empty our faith of its supernatural elements, or deny the absolute Deity of the Son of God. We may, even in identical terms, preach Christ crucified, and offer the treasures of pardon and immortality to guilty and fallen men. Ay, and we may still maintain an invincible faith in the final triumph of that charity which "beareth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," and of which we are told it shall never fail. It is our earnest prayer that this Congress may be memorable in the history of your many notable assemblies, that you may be guided by that Spirit of wisdom and love whose presence you have invoked, and that from you may stream forth those influences of truth, righteousness, and holiness which are the true life-blood of nations.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

MR. MACALLAN, MR. SHAKESPEARE, AND MY DEAR BRETHREN.—It gives me heartfelt satisfaction indeed, speaking in the name of the Congress, to receive your very kind and sympathetic address. You know that we are met together here to deliberate matters more especially concerning the wants and interests of our own

community; but in a very considerable degree, perhaps in a larger degree, we are to consider matters which concern the well-being of the whole Christian body; and in our deliberations we shall be very thankful for the kindly interest and sympathy of those who, though separated from us by important differences, yet are our brethren in Christ. Those differences, as you have stated in your address, are undoubtedly real and important. They are differences, not merely on matters of Church government, but also in matters of doctrine. To deny this would be vain, to forget it would be unreal; but anyone who is imbued with the spirit of the Gospel could see how, notwithstanding our differences, there is, underlying, a vast amount of common Christian truth which we all equally hold. For example, what could be of greater importance to an immortal being than to consider what is the end and object of human life? Now, your object in life and ours is precisely the same—namely, to glorify God by striving to do His will, by carrying on in His name the great warfare of good against evil, of God against all the powers of vice, of sin, of indifference, and of unbelief. Again, if we look to credenda, the sphere in which our differences exist, what is the one great question of the world, the great question of the past ages, and the question of the present day—the question which really differentiates between man and man, the question upon the answer to which everything depends? Surely it is the one great question—"What think ye of Christ?" And thanks be to God, to that question you and I return precisely the same answer. We believe that Christ is the Eternal Son of God, for us made Man, our only Saviour, the only Mediator between God and man. And if we turn, only for a moment, to consider the sphere of Christian works, we cannot but rejoice, dear brethren, in the manifold good works performed with so much love and zeal by the great Nonconformist community. I, as Bishop of this extensive diocese, should be ungrateful indeed if I did not candidly acknowledge the great services to religion that have been rendered by Nonconformist bodies, more especially in the rural districts of East Anglia. In many and many a village, surrounded by infidelity, unbelief, and vice, religion has been in no inconsiderable degree kept alive by the Nonconformist chapel, which has indeed ministered in spiritual things to the souls of the people. And as you are good enough, in your address, to refer to the great and glorious missionary work of the Church, it would be ungenerous in me if I did not touch upon your own very zealous and highly fruitful labours in that direction. It was with great pleasure I read in a newspaper a few days ago that your London Missionary Society has now the very splendid income of £180,000 a year. I must frankly say that I think that in such a point as that you perhaps read a lesson to us of the more wealthy Church of England. I may add that in my own personal experience I have visited islands of the Pacific which have been redeemed from the curse of heathenism entirely by the labours of Nonconformist missionaries. These are good works, for which we glorify God. They could only have been performed under the grace of God by the power of the Holy Spirit. And, therefore, we acknowledge, and gladly and thankfully acknowledge, that your labours in these directions have been graciously owned by the Holy Spirit. Having these thoughts in our minds, dear friends, we are deeply grateful to you for your kindly interest and the assurance of your prayers. Alas! alas! I suppose because of our sins, the blessing of visible and external unity is at present denied to us. But in the meantime, not only can we abstain from aggravation and opposition, and regard each other with mutual respect: *that* all men may do; but assuredly we can esteem each other who are in the bond of Christian love as being common disciples of the same loving Lord. And so we can pray for the time when the unity of the Spirit, which God bestows upon all His elect, may be visibly manifested in the world by the spectacle of their being but one fold under one Shepherd. I thank you.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT then proceeded to deliver his

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP, MR. MAYOR, MY RIGHT REV. AND REV. BRETHREN, AND MY BRETHREN OF THE LAITY—

It is now my pleasant duty to open the proceedings of our Congress by offering to you, in the name of the Church in this diocese, a very hearty welcome. Coming as you do, not for mere purposes of holiday-making—though we have every reason to hope, relying upon the hospitality and goodwill of the citizens of the ancient and loyal city of Norwich, that your sojourn here will be a pleasant one—but coming here to consider in common various aspects of the truths revealed of God, the historic claims, the rights, the duties, and the policy of God's Church in this land, we receive you with all the greater joy because of our common heritage in the faith, and with an earnest prayer that our conference may be for our common spiritual good. "Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord. We have wished you good luck ye that are of the house of the Lord."

It is now thirty years since the Church Congress last met at Norwich; years of vast importance; years, like every other period in the history of man, of chequered complexion; but years upon which the Church may look back upon the whole, as I believe, with devout thankfulness and with aspirations of gratitude to her Divine Head.

Some of us remember well the leading incidents of that Congress. It so happened that it was the only occasion on which I was ever in East Anglia before I was called to my present position. Some are still left amongst us who took part in its debates. And some, many, who were then leaders in the Church Militant, having laid down their arms, have fallen asleep, and are now waiting in a blissful hope for their crown. Your predecessor, my Lord Archbishop, whose example you have so kindly followed in preaching to us this morning—may God make your words fruitful in the advancement of truth and peace!—the famous Bishop of Oxford, great in his eloquence, greater yet, as some of us think, in the high standard which he set for the work of an English diocesan bishop; Dr. Pusey; my own dear noble-minded vicar, Dr. Hook; and, speaking from the Episcopal throne of this diocese, I would say, more than all, the President of that Congress, my

venerated predecessor, so well known by those over whom he ruled so long, and where known so well beloved, remarkable equally for the sweetness of his disposition, his personal sanctity, his administrative ability, and the firmness of his rule—all these are gone from amongst us. God has had a better thing for them than that they should remain here. "Right dear in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." May we be fired by their example! May we have grace and wisdom to avoid whatever errors they may have committed! May we soon rest in peace with them under the care of Him Who hath the keys of death and of hell; and together, we with them and they with us, may we enter in God's good time through the gates of pearl into the city of God! Amen.

"What is the use of a Church Congress?" I would reply—though I am by no means an authority upon the point, for I have not myself been a Congress-going man—that the use of the Church Congress appears to me to be this, to assist in forming and also in partially expressing the public opinion of the Church on the current Church questions of the day. A highly useful function assuredly. For not only is it of importance that they who act for the Church should be made acquainted with the views of Churchmen, but also in an indirect way the Congress has an influence upon the life of the Church; since many, both clergy and laity, will go away to put into operation in their respective parishes the ideas which they have gathered from its deliberations.

If, then, I have rightly estimated the function of the Church Congress, it will be obvious that the spirit and object and result of each annual meeting will differ in some degree from those of its predecessors. For the condition and prospects of the Church, its dangers and hopes, its successes or failures, are ever changing; or, at least presenting different aspects. And the good ship, desiring to do her appointed work, and sail her true course, must, from time to time, shift her sails according to the currents set in motion by actual events, and the varying winds of human thought and feeling. Our Norwich Congress of this year will be of a different spirit and temper from the Norwich Congress of 1865; nay, even from the Exeter Congress of last year. For much has happened within the past thirty years, and somewhat even in the past year. And we have now, by God's goodness, to address ourselves to the questions and hopes, the difficulties and the suitable aims of the present day.

Compared with our own, the time of the Congress of 1865 was a time of greater timidity, hesitation, perplexity, and alarm. We were then in the midst of the difficulties caused by the Colenso controversy, the question of the Church courts, and the dread of Erastian aggressions upon the spiritual province of the Church. Comparatively, the present is a time of peace. But, while thankful for this, we should not, perhaps, make too much of it, for we know not how long the present peace may last. But in the meantime the Church has grown (D.G.) far stronger, and is more conscious of her strength. We have now for many years past been learning both a truer conception of the Church, and the high vocation to which God in His loving Providence has called the Church of England. How different is the spirit pervading the Church now from what it was in times past, when her adherents thought of her only as a favoured body whose privileges were to be defended, if not to the death, yet, at all events, as long as voices and lungs could defend them! when Churchmen in the time of Sacheverell bawled themselves hoarse with the cry of "The Church in danger!" or when in the Georgian era, in the time of pluralities and absentee rectors and political bishops, and the Church was going steadily down hill, as this diocese could bear witness, Tory squires would shout forth the toast and Churchmen throw their caps into the air for "Church and King!" Why, the idea of the Church is very different, and the standard set up for her very different, from what it was in the days of our boyhood. How much less was she respected—nay, how much more bitterly was she then hated—by those who did not belong to the privileged body! How confidently was she told to set her house in order, for her days were almost numbered! And how largely was this foreboding believed in by her own anxious adherents! Those were days when the Church was commonly spoken of as "The Establishment." In saying this I do not mean that we undervalue, or shall fail in our duty in maintaining, God helping us, the historic position of the National Church. But this, I trust, we shall do, not as holding fast with a merely human tenacity to a position of privilege; but as a matter of duty to our King, Who has called us to a spiritual work, a great work, for the souls whom He loves. And as He Who has called us to this work has also by His providential government placed us in the position suitable for performing it, we desire, if He will enable us, to maintain our position only that we may be the better able to do the work which He has given us to do.

It is this principle which mainly influenced many of us in our resistance to the attack upon the Church in Wales. It was not so much the attempt to take away our endowments, with no sufficient justification as we believe, which moved us—though this would have been a loss to us and a temporary weakening of our power to do good. But if our revenues had against our will been taken away from us, well! we should have set to work as soon as possible to make up the loss. But it is otherwise with the Establishment. That position gives us, as we believe—those of us who have lived in the colonies or the United States are sure of it—a commanding position from which we can do a work for God and the souls of men which otherwise could not be done. This vantage-ground we look upon as a talent intrusted to us by our Divine Head. It will be woe unto us if by our mere supineness we allow it to be taken away from us. And, I may add, it will be woe unto us if by our negligence or indolence we allow it to remain in our hands unused.

While upon this subject I may remark in passing that the question of the establishment or disestablishment of the Church depends really upon ourselves. By all means let us inform our people concerning the past history and claims of the Church; and show them of what signal benefit she has been to the nation. It is strange and regrettable how ill-informed even those who are considered our best-educated people are upon these points. But, after all, the argument upon which all will be found to turn must be obtained not from the past, but from the present. As long as the great majority of the nation believe that the Church of England is doing a good work for the temporal, moral, and spiritual wellbeing of the masses of the people, so long will she remain the Established Church.

As the Church of England has the more truly realized the work for the souls of His people which God has intrusted to her, she has learned the better, though the lesson is not quite learned as yet, to put forth that free action which is within the power of every community of believing Christians, but which for long she hesitated to employ because of her connection with the State. In the days of our boyhood, at the time of the founding of our great colonies in Australia and New Zealand, it was largely expected and desired that the State would supply, as in our older colonies, the means of grace for our colonists. But the expectation, which was itself a hindrance, quickly passed away. The Church has learned at her Lord's command to "launch out into the deep and let down her nets for a draught." And as she has learned to

do this, and in her own free action as a Christian community to rely upon the faith and piety and zeal of the voluntary efforts of her own members, so not only has she grown in numbers and external influence, but her evangelizing efforts have reacted upon herself, and have fostered the piety and love of her own children. As one significant item it is worth reminding you that since my predecessor addressed the Congress from this platform the Church of England has founded forty-one colonial and missionary sees, seven in England (including Bristol), and eighteen suffragan bishoprics. We have come to see that our relation to the State does neither prevent nor supersede the necessity of our putting forth as a Christian community the free action of love and zeal in every department of Christian work. And as this has been recognized, and as men have seen that the Church is not actuated by the mere selfish desire of advancing her own party interests, but by the noble ambition of being ever increasingly an instrument in God's hands of ministering to the people of the land the Gospel of grace and salvation, of promoting their temporal, moral, and spiritual wellbeing, and indeed of advancing the cause of truth and righteousness throughout the world, so has the Church risen steadily in the estimation of the nation, and in the respect even of those who are outside her communion; and thus her position has become more secure and more influential for good.

It is through this growing respect for the aims and beneficent work of the Church, and only through this, as I believe, that we shall be enabled to carry out such reforms within the Church as may the better enable her to fulfil her Lord's commission.

Assuredly, too, we have reason thankfully to believe that within the past thirty years there has been an undoubted softening of the spirit of party within our rank. Archbishop Thomson, in his sermon to the Norwich Congress of 1865, used these words:—"We, that are but a section of the Western Church, are torn and torn again." I do not think that we should be likely to employ such language now. There are still very considerable differences of opinion among us, even on important points, and differences of usage also in ceremonial matters. And hostile controversialists, who are ever eager to make a point against us, delight in flinging this in our teeth. But I believe that too much is sometimes made of this by dissatisfied and desponding friends, as well as by implacable foes. There has ever been a considerable variety both of opinion and usage in the Catholic Church. Go back in

thought to the time when there were as many millions of Christians in the various countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa as there are at the present day of Anglicans throughout the world, and, setting aside perhaps a handful of eccentric men who come under no law, I believe the thesis could be maintained that there is no greater variety of faith and practice among the latter now than there was in ancient days among the former.

Moreover, the unique position of the Church of England and the peculiar difficulties she has had to confront must be taken into account. The Reformation found her with a system of philosophical religion so elaborate, so refined, so finely drawn, that our forefathers, when brought face to face with the doctrines of the Bible, were unable to bear it, and the scholastic system passed away. Since that time the Church of England has had to do with the Anglo-Saxon race—a race of great strength, energy, and independence of character, with all the advantages and drawbacks of such qualities, far less deferential to the spirit of authority in intellectual and religious matters than the Latin races, attached to freedom of thought, and ever holding fast to the great and fruitful truth—source of responsibility and truthfulness, moral vigour, and paramount sense of duty—the supremacy of the individual conscience. And as the qualities of the Anglo-Saxon race have had their part in giving shape to the Anglican Church, so on the other hand the Church has reacted upon the nation and has assisted in moulding the character of the Englishman. The Church, too, has been brought by facts into intimate relations with the State—a State that has assumed different forms, from the autocracy of the Tudors down to the virtual supremacy of the House of Commons; a State which has gradually, apparently from the necessity of the case, detached itself from all doctrinal restrictions. To maintain essential Catholic truth while in relation with a State constituted as that of Great Britain is in actuality, and thus to minister the Gospel of the grace of God to the English people, this is the vocation, unprecedented, undreamt of in the primitive times, difficult indeed, but glorious, to which God has by His Providence called the Church of England. We hope, we humbly but firmly believe, that she will be far better able to fulfil her task, and guard the sacred deposit committed to her, and answer the ends of religion amongst us, constituted as she is, with all her drawbacks, than if she had been able to present and enforce a religious system over-burdened with dogmas, and elaborated by human reasonings and

deductions, such as practically was and is still enforced upon the adherents of the unreformed Church.

The Latin races of the South are bidden to accept their system of religion, with all its modern additions, simply upon the authority of their religious teachers. So long as implicitly and without question they defer to that authority, all seems to go well. But if for any reason that fails them: if they cease implicitly to believe in their teachers, or through the course of political events are brought into antagonism with them, or are unable to accept any of the modern developments of the system, which is a matter of "all or nothing," then they are helpless; they have nothing to fall back upon; their one ground of religion is gone from under them; and religion is abandoned, perhaps hated and reviled. Whatever may be the value under other circumstances of a form of personal religion which relies absolutely upon the direction of another, in times such as the present, of free thought, new theories, and eager religious and political controversy, it often proves but a broken reed to lean upon. Those who are acquainted with the state of religion and social life in Italy, Spain, and Central America, will not, I believe, be disposed to regret, far otherwise, the chain of circumstances which under God's Providence has led us to our present position; nor to wish that we, like the people of these countries, had rejected the opportunity afforded to us at the Reformation. I say this in no polemical spirit, but to put forward the reminder that it is unfaithful as well as unwise to dwell too exclusively upon our shortcomings, or still more, the difficulties in which our Church is placed. There are difficulties and drawbacks for the Church of God everywhere. Our present condition is one of imperfection. We believe, and we see nothing in the condition of foreign nations to make us waver in our belief, that this great English nation did right well to accept the call to a Reformation, which, though it may have been accompanied with some drawbacks, has led us in the way of truth, and of truth's ally and companion, liberty. I have thought it well to advance these considerations by way of reassuring any who might possibly be affected by the charges brought against us by hostile controversialists of the diversity or indefiniteness of our teaching.

That the asperities of party spirit have been softened amongst us of recent years there is, I suppose, little doubt. And it may be that Church Congresses have had some little share in bringing about this improvement. I remember that, coming to the last Norwich Church

Congress fresh from my log hut on Frazer River, where in the presence of the miseries of heathenism, and the frequent godlessness of the pioneers of civilization, Christian men, while retaining their principles, were almost compelled to eschew the spirit of party, I was somewhat saddened by unnecessary manifestations of party spirit at the Congress. Will you authorize me to anticipate—for, indeed, the matter rests with you—that we shall show an improvement in this respect? It is a good mental and moral exercise for us to learn self-restraint by listening quietly and patiently to the setting forth of opinions that we entirely disapprove of. To applaud, when sentiments are uttered with which we coincide, is agreeable to ourselves, and gives vivacity to the meeting. But when, on the other hand, it is our hard fate to hear the emphatic statement of views that we abominate, we can indeed allow burning indignation to smoulder in our bosoms; but surely we can exercise the rational prerogative of a dignified silence, instead of borrowing the sibilant language of a portion of the feathered tribe.

One interesting sign of the increased growth and strength of the Church is the yearning for a nearer drawing together of the various Christian bodies, which has been so marked a characteristic of recent years, and has found expression in the programme of our Congress. For the discussion of "hindrances to unity" implies a longing that those hindrances may be overcome and a consideration of steps that may be taken to that end. We shall consider this subject, I trust, with no feelings of self-interest, nor with any idea that we require for the maintenance of our position the aid or the recognition of any other Christian communities. Our longing for greater unity is not that of the invalid who desires a stronger arm to lean upon. It is rather that of the soldier who trusts, God helping him, to be able to do his duty, and so looks round with kindly eyes upon those who, though not of his corps, nor employing the same weapons, are marching alongside, and instinctively desires to draw nearer to them in the spirit of comradeship for the furtherance of their common aims. The subject in one aspect thereof will derive additional interest from the letter which the Pope of Rome addressed last spring to the English nation. It is very easy to make too much of that letter and attach to it a meaning which in reality it has not. It is easy, too, to make use of it for merely controversial purposes—a course from which I trust we shall be preserved in our discussions. There is really no necessity for this. There is no reason, I apprehend, to believe that Romanism is making, or is likely to make,

any appreciable progress among our fellow-countrymen. We have our principles, and from them we have not the least intention of deviating. And this fact enables us all the better to give a dispassionate and respectful consideration to the Pope's letter. It is easy, of course, to say, as has been said, that there can be no question of unity as long as the Papacy abates none of its pretensions, as long as its spirit remains the same as ever—the spirit of the medieval ages, the spirit of the Encyclical and Syllabus of Pius IX. This is true, no doubt. But there is, indeed, no question at present of union, or, indeed, of any practical approximation towards union. It may also be said that it is eminently unreal of the Pope to speak of unity while his emissaries, the Anglo-Roman party in England, are with unexampled eagerness endeavouring to entice away our people from our fold, and speak of our Church in tones of arrogance and bitterness which grieve and repel us; tones in which, truth to tell, we fail to recognize the spirit of the Divine Master. This may be so, and we are sorry for it. But regrettable though this is, it need not divert us from receiving apparently kindly advances in a kindly spirit. The fact remains that the Pope of Rome, the head of the most numerous section of Christians in the world, has invited us in a letter, to all of whose statements indeed we cannot assent, but of a truly Christian tone, to appreciate the blessings of unity and to unite with him in prayer that in His own good time God would give us all that blessed oneness in the faith which all Christians must desire. To us on every ground such a request is and must be congenial. There is no need for us to compose a prayer to meet the request of the Roman Pontiff. We pray, and always have prayed, daily in our Liturgy that "the Catholic Church may be so guided and governed by God's good spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life," and I suppose that most of us in our private devotions pray daily for the unity of all Christians in the truth. Moreover, we have excommunicated neither the East nor the West. Thank God, the Church of England is not a Church of anathemas! But, as I say, this invitation (which no one could imagine being sent by a Pope of the Hildebrandine period to those who have deliberately rejected his authority) is a Christian one, which every Christian community must be glad to receive; it is, moreover, a touching one, proceeding from an aged prelate whose course is almost run. Coming from one occupying so great, so unique a position in the

Christian world, a man of a kindly, gentle spirit, and saintly life, we are disposed to give his message a sympathetic and kindly welcome. This we do unmoved by the inadmissible, nay preposterous, claims that have been put forward on his behalf; claims which the history of the past rejects, and in the future are assuredly doomed to disappointment. Looking to the tendency of men's minds throughout the world, the drift of human thought, the rising intellectual and moral forces which influence the world of men and appear likely to influence them increasingly in time to come, the growth and prevalence of principles inconsistent with the Papal system, the fact that the great rising nations of the world have not only rejected the Papal rule, but appear to owe their pre-eminence to the fact that they are under the influence of a spirit incompatible with its spirit, the notion that the Christian world will ever pass under the domination of the Roman Pontiff seems to us inconceivable, nothing but the baseless dream of the religious partisan.

Probably it will be with no less interest, and perhaps more of hope, that we shall listen to the discussion on hindrances to union with Protestant Nonconformists. Not that there is any prospect of organic union with any of the Nonconformist bodies; nor, indeed, does there appear to be on their part any strong desire for such a union. But, unless I am mistaken, our relations with them have during the past thirty years been continually becoming more friendly. And friendliness and peace are only less blessed than absolute unity. For these improved relations several reasons may be given. The removal of grievances, as, whether rightly or wrongly, they were regarded, by the abolition of compulsory Church-rates and the Burials Act (measures which at the time were considered by Churchmen in general as highly injurious to the Church), has in actuality, I believe, by the good hand of our God upon us, turned out to her advantage. For grievances, or supposed grievances, having been removed, feelings of animosity have been softened; and Nonconformists have been better disposed to appreciate the position, to listen to the doctrines, and join in the worship of the Church. And thus, indeed, the Church has gained more friends, and even adherents. There has arisen too, of recent years, a very happy perception that in some all-important matters, as in the sacred cause of morality, we can work together with the utmost cordiality for the overcoming of sin and misery by the power of good. And as the Church has grown in love and zeal and good works, pious Nonconformists—for I am not speaking now of those

whom we call political Dissenters—have been led to recognize the power for good that she is in the land, and have been drawn nearer to her with feelings of respect. There are now multitudes of Nonconformists, more perhaps than at any previous period of our history, who, still retaining, and having no intention of abandoning, their position of Nonconformity, entertain no feelings of hostility towards the Church; nay in many cases would support her if attacked, at times are glad to take part in our worship, and are not unwilling that their children should join our communion. There is assuredly in this both matter for thankfulness and also that which helps to indicate our best and wisest course of action. There can be no question of our changing our principles, modifying our doctrines, or abandoning our hold of the Apostolic Ministry. But, consistently with holding fast to the principles of the Church, which we believe to be those of the Word of God, and of the first and purest ages of Christianity; principles which appear to us to be standing the test of time and circumstance, and the strain of the controversies and newly-arising problems of the age—we desire not merely to conciliate, but further to show our fraternal good-will towards those who, though, alas! separated from us by important differences, are yet our brethren in Christ. We should, I think, gladly act with them whenever we can do so consistently and without causing confusion in the minds of our own people as to the doctrines that we hold, or the historical position on which we stand. We should also, as I think, be willing, and more than willing, to obliterate all lines of demarcation which are not required for the maintenance of our own just rights. As an illustration, I may refer to a Bill brought into the late Parliament for the regulation of cemeteries and other burial-places. Now, we have obviously a full right to the free exercise of our religious belief and the religious customs which we value. Among those religious customs is that of setting apart our burial-places with solemn prayer to God, to Whose loving care we commit the bodies of our dear ones, according to the forms of the Church. Any endeavour on the part of those who are hostile, or fail to appreciate our feelings upon this point, to prevent the Church from consecrating a portion of our cemeteries for the burial of her dead is, indeed, an act of mere intolerance, which we are bound to resist. Neither could we accept, nor ought we to be asked to accept, any regulation which would reduce our consecration to a hollow unreality. But then our just right of consecrating a burial-place for our dead does not require the making

any visible difference, nor the erecting any fence of demarcation or palpable boundary line between the consecrated and unconsecrated portions. It is enough, surely, if our people can everywhere be interred according to their desire and the custom of the Church in duly consecrated ground. Again, it would be with regret that we should see an Act of the Legislature compelling us on any occasion to toll our bells, which are indeed the property of the Church. But why should it not be done as an act of Christian courtesy? For my own part, I should be right glad that, when desired, the church bells should be tolled for every funeral and rung for every wedding. For we should be glad that we have it in our power to gratify the innocent wishes of our fellow-citizens. We do not desire to limit our human sympathies to those who think and believe just as we do; but, applying not only to our fellow-Churchmen, but to our fellow-Christians, the great principle of the Gospel, we desire to "rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep."

With regard to the internal condition of the Church, there seems to be a widespread desire that the present juncture should be utilized for the passing of such needful measures and reforms as may be helpful to the Church in the performance of her Divine commission. God grant that it may be so! But we shall probably not be wise to expect too much. Personally, I could have wished that the programme of our Congress had been so framed that more of our needed reforms could have been brought under discussion. But it is to be remembered that it was drawn up some months ago, when the political outlook was not the same as at present. Still, I hope that our debates may aid in giving shape to the opinions of thoughtful Churchmen upon some of the pressing questions of the day: *e.g.*, it is high time that Churchmen, indeed all supporters of voluntary schools, should arrive at such a clear understanding of our needs that we may be able to bring before the Legislature a definite policy, and press it forward with our united strength. I hope that by sifting the various schemes before the public, we may contribute something towards forming the mind of the Church upon this all-important matter. I will not in any way anticipate the discussion. My own views I have had the opportunity of setting forth in Convocation. I will only express my hope that the question of the children of the Church in board schools may obtain a due place in the discussion.

There is another most pressing subject upon which I could have

wished, from my position, to say somewhat, viz., "The financial position of the Church;" for a bishop cannot but have a fuller knowledge than most men of the distressing state of poverty to which considerable numbers of the clergy are at the present time reduced. But it is better that I should reserve what I have to say until the time of the discussion itself. But, as a present contribution to the debate, it may be useful for me to lay before you the following statistics. In the diocese of Norwich there are 124 benefices (I will not call them "livings") under £100 per annum; the average net value is £66. There are 292 benefices between £100 and £200 per annum, average net value £151. There are 220 benefices between £200 and £300 per annum, average value £243. There are 145 benefices between £300 and £400 per annum, average value £342. Out of 931 benefices in the diocese, 781 are below £400 per annum, and 416 below £200. There are some benefices of greater value; but when the depreciation in tithe and the large outgoings are taken into account, the difference between the gross and the actual value is seen to be remarkable. I have now, since I have been in the diocese, been enabled, by God's good Providence, personally to visit some 700 parishes, and obtain particulars from the incumbents themselves. In that number, I find from my note-book, there were only three which, when the necessary outgoings were paid, brought in £600 per annum to the incumbent. And as these in times past have been reckoned rich benefices, there are large rectory-houses and grounds attached. I doubt whether in any one of these cases the house and grounds could be properly kept up unless the rector had means of his own. These facts, barely stated, will help to show the state of things in this part of England.

I have desired, without anticipating more than I could help the course of our debate, to indicate, in touching upon one or two salient points, the spirit in which it should be carried on.

I trust that we may enter upon our discussions in no mere spirit of partisanship. The partisan aims at the triumph of the party to which he has given in his adherence. The truth-seeker desires the elucidation of the truth. We do, indeed, approach the subjects that we are to consider bound together by the same creed, a common belief in the same essential truths. Let us remember that we are to treat of things that make for our eternal peace, matters which concern the life and progress of the Church of the Redeemer; and let us discuss these high subjects—whether those in which we differ from other Christian

communities, or those in which we ourselves do not think alike—as believing disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let the truth be spoken assuredly, and let it be spoken in love.

Let us enter upon our debates in no spirit of complacency. Thank God we have been preserved from the mistake of thinking our Church faultless. The Church of God is Divine, it is true. It is also, like her Divine Head, human. The human body of the Lord was not exempt from such innocent weaknesses as hunger, and fatigue, and pain. The Church, as a society of human beings, is not exempt from those flaws, weaknesses, and shortcomings to which all societies of fallible, sinful human beings are liable. It is the Divine will that the human being is for his probation to be tried with divers temptations. So, also, the Church is tested and grieved with imperfections and failures, which in her—in this unlike her Divine Lord—are more or less the result of sin. The ideal Church exists only in the longing imagination of the believer. The history of the Catholic Church has been a history of struggle against evil without and evil within—a struggle oft baffled, never perfectly successful, yet ever renewed in faith and hope. And the Catholic Church in England has had, and still has, her own peculiar trials, shortcomings, and imperfections. She has, for example, beyond question, made striking progress, notably within the past thirty years, as I myself can bear witness, in our rising colonies, and also in her evangelizing work among the heathen. Yet, both in the one case and in the other, there are grievous deficiencies to be noted. In many of our colonies the Church has taken firm root, and is expanding vigorously. In others it is comparatively backward; hampered, perhaps, by notions brought by the colonists from the mother country, and exhibiting a lack of enterprise and of the spirit of self-help. It is also to be sorrowfully confessed that Church-people at home, engrossed with their own affairs, do not as a body by any means realize their responsibilities as they ought, whether to our own countrymen who, forced by the pressure of circumstances at home, have gone forth to seek a livelihood in distant lands; or to the aborigines who were dwelling in the countries of which we have taken possession. Considering the unparalleled influence upon the world wielded at the present time by England, the greatest of historic empires, the responsibility of our country and our Church is weighty, solemn, awe-inspiring.

Undoubted shortcomings are also to be lamented at home, and we

have need of not a few reforms. We need, for example, measures to be taken enabling aged or incapacitated incumbents, who are no longer able to perform the work of their cures efficiently, to resign their benefices. This many of them would gladly do, inasmuch as they themselves perceive and lament their own incapacity, were it not that in their case resignation would mean beggary. We need, then, not only a sound system of clergy pensions, but some means of inducing all the clergy to make provision for possible future years of old age and narrow circumstances. We need also an additional fund, contributed by the wealthy, from which the provident payments of the clergy themselves could be supplemented. With regard to this diocese, for example, I would that all wealthy laymen should know that in my judgment nothing whatever would more effectually help on the work of the Church in East Anglia in her efforts to benefit the souls of men than the establishment of a fund, say of £20,000, to aid in pensioning off aged or permanently invalid incumbents. If there were something like adequate provision made for retirement, then those clergy who are no longer able to fulfil efficiently their spiritual duties might be induced to resign their cures, to the great benefit of the souls of God's people.

We need, also, some means whereby the Christian laity may be able to make an appeal against the imposition of a pastor, who, as they have reason to believe, is unworthy or unsuited for the post. We have reason to hope that a good deal will be done in this important but delicate and difficult matter by legislation during this present Parliament.

We need certainly, especially in our country districts, more hearty co-operation between the clergy and their people. The active sympathy and work of the laity needs to be more largely enlisted on behalf of the Church. And in saying this I am alluding not only to the wealthy and influential, but to the laity of all sorts and conditions. Because of the practical independence of the clergy, it has come to pass that in too many of our parishes the lay people have been accustomed to do or to give, merely because they have been asked, or indeed permitted, to do or to give, simply nothing whatever for their Church. Though the people may have been attending the services of the Church, they have had neither part nor lot in her. They have not shared in her counsels or her efforts, and have, therefore, no real living interest in her affairs, her needs, or her progress. "That, as is supposed, is the clergyman's

affair, not theirs." If anything is to be done it must be done by the clergyman or his family. If anything is to be supplied it must, of course, be supplied by him. And this state of things has conduced not to the strength of the Church, but to her weakness. For, as everyone knows who is acquainted with human nature, people are never enthusiastic for any cause which makes no demands upon them, to which they contribute neither of their work nor of their substance. We want to show our people that their Church belongs not to the clergyman, but to them and their children in future generations. We want to engage their sympathy and hearty goodwill, and to draw all classes together in common love and common work for the Church. We need an obliteration of class distinctions in religious matters, a truer sense of Church fellowship, of our oneness in Christ.

We need an extension of the movement already begun in our towns for the formation of parochial Church councils, not enforced by law, but established voluntarily.

We need also, for the purpose of adapting the system of the Church to the requirements of the times, power for the Church—doubtless under such control from the State as would prevent her stepping beyond her own proper spiritual sphere—to make such regulations, bye-laws, perhaps, I may call them, as would the better enable her to carry on her spiritual work among the people. And for this purpose doubtless a reform of Convocation is desirable, though not indispensable. For the essential point would be that such reforms or regulations as might be made, as, for example, any measures for shortening or re-arranging our Sunday services, should secure the general adhesion of the Church.

But there is no need to go through a catalogue of all that we need to make up the deficiencies of our Zion. We need more zeal, and self-denial, and energetic work in the clergy, and more active co-operation, and zealous work, and generous giving in our laity; and more spirituality and personal holiness in all. Yes, as I have said, we do not pretend that our Church is faultless. We have many faults, shortcomings, and imperfections to lament. But the Church has battled, and is still battling, with them, and, by God's blessing, with much success. We have this encouragement, than which none can be greater—that we have not been retrograding, nor standing still, but advancing all along the line. The Church has, upon the whole—making allowance for human infirmity—been earnestly striving to do

the work committed to her, has been developing power and resources unsuspected alike by friend and foe, and has manifested a growth in faith and zeal, in good works of piety and charity, in deepened spirituality and personal holiness in her members, to which it is difficult indeed in these latter ages to find a parallel. Of this the Church herself is conscious, and it fills her with joy and confidence; for she whispers to herself, "Yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me" Growth is a sign of life; spiritual growth is a proof of Divine life. None can produce such results as these but "the Lord, the Giver of Life." We know that He, the Divine Paraclete, hath given His blessing to our Zion, that "God is in the midst of her, therefore shall she not be removed."

Inspired by this thought, let us set ourselves to do the work which God has given us to do. For wherefore is the Church thus shielded and sanctified by the Holy Ghost? That she may preserve the sacred deposit of faith? Undoubtedly. But also that she may actively carry on the work of God in the world. And so the Church girds herself for the task set her by her Divine Head. The Church of England rests, as does the whole Gospel Kingdom, upon the sure ground of historic fact. But while this gives her confidence, she will not suppose that to rest upon this is the object of her mission. The army must have its base secure; otherwise, indeed, it is in jeopardy. But its business is to go forward and contend for victory. "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." It must be plain to all who have eyes to see how great is the work to which the Supreme Governor of the world has called the Church of England. How striking is the thought that in another century there will be, according to calculations made, one thousand million people in the world speaking our vigorous English tongue! To be a chief instrument, if she will rise to her opportunities, of ministering the Gospel of salvation to the world-spreading Anglo-Saxon race in this wonderful age, and the wonderful ages yet to come, times of change, of controversy, of material progress, of discovery in the world of thought and science, of bold inquiry and eager speculation ever going on; while holding fast to the prime revealed truths of the Gospel, which because revealed may never be changed nor forgotten, yet to adapt herself to the wants of the age, and change if need be her methods to meet the requirements of the times; against the ever-varying assaults

made by the proud and restless intellect to defend and elucidate the Christian dogma—and, oh! how thankful, my friends, we ought to be for the pre-eminent part which the Church of England in our own generation has taken by her noble literature in this indispensable work! —to uplift the Cross of Christ in every corner of the world where Christian zeal and English energy can penetrate; and by ministering the good things of God to the immortal soul to be ever adding to the number of the redeemed, and thus preparing for the coming of the Lord—this is the glorious work to which our Church has been called by her Lord. And may we not believe—assuredly, it is no partiality which moves us to believe—that by His Providential dealing God has intended to fit her for the task which He has laid upon her. Mercifully preserved in all her vicissitudes from abandoning any essential part of Catholic truth, in her past history she has overcome many obstacles, and, like the shining glacier on its onward march, has cast out from her bosom not a few impurities. In the great crisis of the sixteenth century, for which the medieval Church was responsible, she was enabled to get rid of doctrines and practices which would have sorely hampered her in her work, because incapable of defence; and which assuredly will appear more and more indefensible by reason in the coming years. She is in many ways calculated to be the organ of the religious feeling of a free people. If in times past she has leaned too much upon external props, upon a privileged position—at one time upon the favour of arbitrary kings, at another time upon the assistance of the Legislature—she has for some time past been learning the lesson of self-help, and finds that the lesson is a good one, though by no means learned as yet. She has never declared war against the spirit of the age, nor done aught which would prevent her from meeting the wants of the present or succeeding ages. Loyal to constituted authority she must ever be. It is one of her principles. But courageously worked, she is adapted to be a popular institution; and, indeed, in our great towns is being more and more worked upon a popular basis. It is evident, indeed, that in her merely human aspect, as an earthly institution, she is dependent upon the goodwill of the people to whom she has been called to minister. As a God-inspired society, in the exercise of her Divine commission, she depends only and solely upon the loving will of her Divine Head.

Let us see, each and all of us, what we can do to aid her in her mission. Is not this the best and truest work to which we can set

ourselves? After all, do we not realize the fact, and shall we not realize it yet more in the hour of death and in the future world, that the only thing worth living for is to know and do the perfect will of God; to listen all one's life long for the Divine Voice speaking to the soul, and give the response of faith and obedience; to turn ever to the Light, as the sunflower turns towards the sun, and by Divine grace to draw ever nearer to that Light which shall "shine more and more unto the perfect day"? You and I are only permitted to live in order that we may work the works of Him that created and redeemed us while it is day. And to those who fulfil their calling by doing what little may be in their power to extend His empire over the souls of men it shall be granted to hail with glad welcome Him for Whose Advent the Church is ever praying, "Lord, Thy kingdom come."

EDUCATION.

(1) PRESERVATION OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. (*a*) VOLUNTARY. (*b*) BOARD.

(2) FEDERATION OF CHURCH SCHOOLS.

(3) THE REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE.

PAPERS.

The Rev. EVAN DANIEL, Vicar of Horsham, Sussex; and Hon. Canon of Rochester.

THE topic I have to discuss is the Preservation of Religious Education in Elementary Schools, both Voluntary and Board. It at once suggests the question, Is religious education in elementary schools endangered, and, if so, in what ways? In answering this question, it will be convenient to deal with Voluntary and Board schools separately; and, inasmuch as all Voluntary schools are not similarly conditioned, to fix our minds more particularly on Church schools, with which we are here mainly concerned.

Religious education is endangered in Church schools partly because those schools are themselves endangered, partly because there is a risk lest, in order to maintain their existence, we may be tempted to sacrifice the reason for their existence, and partly, I regret to say, because large numbers of Churchmen, who have never themselves had the benefit of definite religious teaching, set so little store upon dogmatic instruction that they would not greatly care to see Church schools superseded by Board schools.

There are, at the present time, many voluntary schools that are in a most precarious position. The managers have made desperate efforts to meet the recent demands of the Education Department—demands

against which I have not a word to say, except, perhaps, where, for the sake of light, schools have been turned into green-houses, and, for the sake of air, into ventilating shafts—but they cannot go on for ever struggling against the competition of School Boards, against the ever-increasing cost of school maintenance, and against the growing unwillingness even of well-disposed Churchmen to pay for education twice over—first, in the form of a school-rate, and, secondly, in subscriptions. Unless speedy and substantial aid from the State be forthcoming, our poorer schools, both in town and country, and more especially in School Board districts, will inevitably have to be closed.

Happily there is a prospect, not remote, of obtaining for our Church schools increased State-aid; but here comes in another danger, that of bartering away our children's birthright for a mess of political pottage. Whether the aid comes out of the rates, or out of the taxes, an organized endeavour is sure to be made to obtain popular representation on our boards of management, and with such representation it may not be easy to secure to our schools perfect freedom either in the selection, control, and dismissal of the teachers, or in the regulation of the religious instruction. I do not say that this difficulty is insuperable, but it is a real difficulty, and must be faced. It assumes its most dangerous form in connection with schemes for rate-aid, but is not wholly absent in schemes for additional State-aid. It may, however, be found that when we have shown a willingness to afford opportunities for other religious bodies to give separate religious instruction to any children of their own faith, who may happen to be in Church schools, the country will see the wisdom and justice of leaving us undisturbed in the instruction of our own children. Of this I am convinced, that in any re-settlement of the education question we must be prepared to give as well as take. We must concede to others what we claim for ourselves; but we must take care that we do not surrender the one thing for which our schools exist. If we cannot maintain in our schools Church teaching, we had better close them altogether.

It ought to be distinctly understood, that if our Church schools do not give definite Church teaching, there are no reasons, except economical reasons, why we should continue to support them. I fail to see why we Churchmen have a greater interest in public economy than any other section of the community. Nor can I conceive any more mischievous policy for Churchmen to pursue than to seem to stand up for Church schools merely because they are cheaper than Board schools. Such a policy may favourably influence the classes upon whom the burden of the school-rate falls most heavily, but it prejudices against the Church the poorer classes, with whom political power now lies, and who see in such appeals to the pockets a desire to starve the education given to their children. We fight for our Church schools, not because they are cheap, but because they give a religious education such as Board schools at their best cannot give, and we ought not to take up lower ground.

A worthier course is, to get Church parents to see for themselves the value of definite religious instruction, and let the demand for such teaching proceed from them. The whole question of religious education has hitherto been too much regarded as mainly affecting managers and churches. It is pre-eminently a parents' question, and it is with the

parents that the ultimate settlement of the question will lie. If Church parents are indifferent to definite religious teaching, our Church schools will inevitably go; if, on the other hand, they are taught to appreciate its value, they will show, as I believe they did, in many cases, show in the last election, that they will not allow their Church schools to be either starved or extinguished. Educate the parents, and the parents will educate our statesmen. The success of every proposed legislative reform depends on the public opinion behind it. Here I confess we have a great deal to do, and little time to do it in. Owing to the widespread neglect of definite teaching, both in the pulpit and in our schools, of all classes, Church parents do not, as a rule, sufficiently value dogmatic instruction. They are universally in favour of religious education of some sort, but too frequently they are not able to discriminate between one form of religious instruction and another. They think that if the Bible is read and explained (it matters not by whom, or in what sense), their children will get all that is needed. Once more, then, I would venture to say, educate the parents. Interest them in Church teaching by public functions, by sermons, by lectures, and by the agency of the press. Teach them what it is the Church believes, and what are the grounds of her belief. This may seem going a long way back, but I am convinced of this, that if the parents do not value Church teaching, all our efforts to maintain our Church schools will be in vain.

In connection with this subject, I would point out that we have much to do in showing Church parents how, by what is called the Compromise, but ought to be called the Great Betrayal of 1870, they have been juggled out of some of the most precious rights that belong to them as English citizens. For twenty-five years they have in School Board districts been penalized for their religious convictions; they have been compelled to contribute to an education fund from which they have not been able to derive any benefit, except under conditions that their consciences will not in many cases allow them to accept; if they have sent their children to Church schools, they have been punished for it in the most cruel way, by seeing them cut off from whatever advantages Board schools derive from an unlimited exchequer. We used to think that the age of religious disabilities was over. Not at all. A Churchman in a School Board district belongs to an inferior order of citizens, who are compelled to pay rates for the education of other people's children, and yet are denied any aid from this source for the education of their own. Where is the old English spirit, which, in other fields, fought against such religious disabilities until they were swept away? How has it come to pass that a new religion, in which nobody believes, has been established and endowed, while the great bulk of the people who contribute the endowments are left out in the cold? But I am forgetting. We *can* get our religious convictions respected, if only we bring up our children in such a way that they shall break the laws and be sent to an Industrial school. It may not be generally known that in Industrial schools, whether residential or day, there is no Cowper-Temple Clause to exclude distinctive religious teaching, and that the children can be educated in the faith of their parents. So that the privilege that is denied to parents who

do their duty to their children is conceded to those who neglect it, and we have only to allow our children to commit a public theft, or otherwise break the law, to obtain for them the privilege of being instructed in the principles of our own faith, even in schools supported, or largely aided, out of the rates.

There is one other condition of the preservation of religious instruction in our Church schools, and that is the maintenance of their efficiency in giving secular instruction. Not even for the sake of religion can we stand between the children whom we undertake to educate and the full intellectual equipment that they will need in the life before them. I cannot sufficiently emphasize this point. When our schools cease to be efficient they ought to cease to exist.

I come to religious education in Board schools. That is endangered by its intrinsic insufficiency, its vagueness, its uncertainty, its divorce from the actual facts of a baptized child's spiritual life, and from the practical duties of religion. Undenominational religion recognizes no Church, no creed, no sacraments. It varies with each School Board, and with the same Board according to the chances of popular elections and gusts of popular feeling. It means one thing to a Church teacher, another to a Unitarian, and something else to an Agnostic. The compromise of 1870 was supposed to exclude only the use of formularies and catechisms distinctive of any particular dénomination; in practice it has often led to the exclusion of some of the most important Christian doctrines. Lord Salisbury said the other day that a compromise was generally understood to be an arrangement in which each of the parties consenting to it gives up something, but that in the so-called compromise of 1870, each of the parties thought he had obtained something. Unfortunately for Churchmen, the something they thought they had got turned out valueless, while the something that the unsectarian party got proved greater than they expected. We were taken in, and I am not quite sure whether we did not deserve to be. The Church has, in matters of faith, nothing to do with compromises.

The only position for the Church to take up is one of absolute freedom to teach full Church doctrine to every child of her communion, whether rich or poor, law-abiding or criminal. We ought not to ask for more, and we ought not to be satisfied with less. At present hundreds of thousands of Church children are in Board schools, who, unless they attend other places of instruction, get no distinctive Church teaching at all; and we are practically showing more indifference to their fate than we do to the spiritual condition of little Negroes on the banks of the Niger. This condition of things is a disgrace to us, and if it be continued, will be followed by a terrible judgment on the Church that is so neglectful of her duty. The Cowper-Temple Clause, that abiding and shameful monument of our sacrifice of principle to political exigencies, must be repealed. The belief in the sufficiency of unsectarian teaching for Church children must be abandoned. Churchmen must claim the right of having their children, without distinction, taught their own faith, their own formularies, and their own catechism. Privileged Scotland has no Cowper-Temple clause, and is allowed the free use of the Assembly's Catechism in its Board schools. Happy Ireland, whose schools are almost wholly supported by the State, can use any catechism it likes. There, in the same school, you may find classes of

different denominations using their own distinctive formularies, with the full sanction of the law. There the lion and the lamb lie down together, and the lamb is *not* inside the lion. There the Roman Catholic, the Irish Churchman, and the Presbyterian agree to differ, while we differ in the vain endeavour to agree. Why should Englishmen be denied privileges accorded to Scotchmen and Irishmen? Why should a catechism be so terrible a thing in England, and so innocent north of the Tweed, or west of the Irish Channel?

It may be asked, Are we in a position to avail ourselves of the privilege I am contending for, even if it were granted? I reply that in our smaller School Board districts we could use it at once, and that even in the larger districts the machinery would soon be forthcoming, if the opportunity for using it were afforded. In parishes where there is no Church school it would be as easy for the incumbent, or his curate, to teach in the Board school as in a Church school. In larger parishes it would be necessary to invoke lay-help, which might be either paid or voluntary. Deaconesses and lady-workers would here find a most useful sphere of work. I am not without hope that so grand an opening would call into existence teaching orders in the Church of England.

It may further be asked, Would not the demand for opportunities to teach Church children in Board schools be met by a corresponding demand on the part of non-Churchmen for opportunities to teach any of their children who might happen to be in Church schools? I have no doubt it would; and I have already hinted that I should be prepared to make such a concession. We must all, I think, recognize the hardship to which Nonconformists are at present subjected in places where there is only one school, and that a Church school.

What should be the attitude of Churchmen towards the religious instruction of children in Board schools not claimed by the religious bodies to which they belong? In *their* case we are bound, I think, to give the utmost religious instruction that the law allows, and, for this reason, it is most important that the Church should be adequately represented on School Boards. We never made a greater mistake than when in 1870 we allowed School Boards to pass into the hands of Nonconformists. It afforded them an opportunity which they were not slow to utilize, of appointing the permanent officials, of interpreting the Education Act in their own sense, and of planting schools without any regard to the interests of the Voluntary schools with which they came into competition. It is of no use, however, to cry over spilt milk. What we have now to do is to see that the Church is well represented on every School Board in the country, and that the largest amount of Christian doctrine is taught in Board schools that Christians can agree upon. There is nothing in the law to prevent the immediate introduction into Board schools of the Apostles' Creed, the common symbol of Christendom. What may be done by resolute Churchmen to give a Christian stamp to religious teaching in Board schools is well illustrated in what was done on the London School Board by Mr. Athelstan Riley, whose action has had a most beneficial effect, not only in London, but all over the country, in opening the eyes of Christian people to the real character of what is called unsectarian teaching. It has been suggested that Churchmen should "capture"

the School Boards. I do not know what that phrase was intended to mean; but I know this, that if Churchmen were adequately represented on School Boards, they would not have to capture them; they would simply be in possession.

But, while I advocate the making the most of the liberty which the law gives us in Board schools, I do most sincerely hope that Churchmen will give up the vain hope of finding out some residual form of Christianity that will satisfy everybody. The system of unsectarian teaching succeeds fairly well as long as it is worked by Christian teachers, but it breaks down when you have teachers who are not Christian, and of this you have in Board schools no guarantee. At its best it is denominationalism in disguise, at its worst it is Christianity without Christ. We may accept unsectarian teaching when we cannot get anything better, but I earnestly entreat Churchmen not to be satisfied, so far as Church children are concerned, with any teaching short of the full teaching of the faith as once delivered to the saints.

---

(2) Federation of Church Schools, etc.

The Rev. W. R. Finch, Vicar of Rennington-with-Rock, Alnwick; and Hon. Sec. of the Newcastle School Management Committee.

Mine is a hard task. It is laid upon me to describe and to discuss "Federation," when no two people are agreed as to the scope and meaning of the term. So far as my enquiries lead me, I have not succeeded in finding any working example of Federation on anything like a diocesan or archidiaconal scale. There are sundry Church School Associations with elaborate rules, complicated procedure, and the fascination of popular elections—but the results of their activity are not such as to strike the beholders with any great awe. It may be most profitable now to try to arrive at a practical definition of Federation, by, in the first place, dogmatically stating what Federation is *not*. Federation is not anything like an elaborate but absolutely unworkable plan sketched in one of the Church newspapers recently, under which it was proposed that all the schools in a diocese should be administered by a central Diocesan Committee. The idea seems to some to have the charm of boldness; there is a "sweep" about it, and that is all that can be said in its favour. True Federation will be something the very reverse of such centralization. Federation is certainly not the supplanting of local management and local responsibility by any non-parochial and foreign body. School managers may not be universally experts, but the local amateur will manage fairly well in local things where the outsider, be he never so expert, will both begin and end in muddle. True Federation is not anything which will enrich the careless at the expense of the careful; it is not anything which will encourage the lax and indolent to greater laxity and indolence, in the expectation that their burdens will in future be borne by others who are more energetic than themselves. Federation will be none of these. Federation will be something that shall develop and supplement local management. It being the first duty of school managers to manage,

any scheme or plan which shall attempt to manage them instead of educating and training them to manage for themselves will be a scheme of bastard Federation to be shunned of all men. I lay it down, therefore, as something beyond argument or discussion, that any practical Federation of schools (if it is to be generally acceptable to school managers) must be in the nature of an auxiliary; it must not try to grab the reins; it must watch, advise, plan, economize, but it must not attempt to rule.

What is the situation—actual and legal? This:—that each "school-district" is self-contained. For ecclesiastical purposes a Church school is bound by the tie of loyalty to the body corporate, but for practical and departmental purposes its interest is strictly limited to the school district in which it stands. Two or more Church schools in the same legal school district have a mass of common interests; such schools may to the best advantage take measures to establish unity of management. But for diocesan or archidiaconal purposes, I am convinced that it is not merely useless but positively mischievous for us to talk of "common management" and "common funds." I, for one, though advocating true Federation, would never consent to quit the parochial quarter-deck and to hand over the school to any diocesan, archidiaconal, or ruri-decanal committee, by whomsoever appointed, or of whomsoever composed. The parish priest knows his own people, their ways and their needs, as no outsider ever does or ever can know them. When the well-intentioned but impracticable enthusiast prates to me of "common management" and the like, I proceed to thrust the tongue of derision into the cheek of scorn. In reply to such a one, I talk not of common funds but common sense. And my disdain is justified by the fact that such experiments as we in Northumberland have made, on the lines of common management, have been both clumsy in operation and failures in effect.

If Federation is to be none of these things, what have we left? We have an admirable object lesson in the arrangements of some of our large School Boards. The School Board, in each instance, settles points of principle, deals with the Education Department, and provides the sinews of war; the local managers attend to detail—hours, holidays, subjects, staff and what-not, down to brooms and brushes. It seems to me that Churchmen may surely endeavour to create an organization on the same broad lines—barring only the provision of £ s. d. There are certain points which are general and common to all schools; there are others which are strictly local and particular. Can we not separate the points which are common to all and make them the subjects of common action, leaving the local detail to be settled on the spot? There should be no real difficulty. The points which are common to all schools concern for the most part Acts of Parliament and Annual Codes, precedents and rulings by the Education Department, the establishment of pupil-teachers' centres, the best methods of banking, the avoiding of the 17s. 6d. limit, and the provision of building plans. This is not an exhaustive list, but it is probably sufficient to show the line. I know that hitherto we have supposed that our various diocesan boards have cared for these things; but in the majority of dioceses it has been a fond delusion. We have gone on in a happy-go-lucky-way—the various boards busying themselves, not with the back-bone

of the work, but with the effort to extract money from one set of people in order to distribute it among another set. In the diocese of Newcastle we have for the last two years attempted a method not so much of "Federation" as of "common action." We have a school clearing house, through which all the official correspondence of the schools is passed on its way to and from the Education Department; that correspondence is carefully copied and filed, and the result is that the diocesan authorities are posted up to date and know exactly what is going on. The results of this method have been valuable; but the revelations made by our clearing house have been invaluable. The official relationship of the various bodies of managers to the Education Department is preserved in a permanent record; the Diocesan Education Committee itself has been educated by the review of this mass of correspondence; we have found out by this means very many things of which three years ago we had no suspicion whatever. Our previous ignorance has caused a loss to the schools of the diocese amounting to many thousands of pounds. The large area covered affords us a comparison of individual examiners and inspectors, with their varying standards and sometimes contradictory decisions; it has enabled us to put the experience of any one school at the service of all the others who act with us; it has brought us into direct touch with "My Lords" on the one hand, and the landlords on the other; it has enabled us to accumulate a mass of precedent and rulings which promises to be of the utmost service; and, finally, we discovered, to our surprise, that "My Lords" are only human, subject to infirmities, even as the rest of mankind, and by consequence liable to make occasional mistakes, which, to their honour be it added, they are usually ready to recall. All this has brought the Diocesan Education Committee into touch with our schools, but we hope gradually to establish still closer connexion with them and with their managers. We not only make no attempt, however, to manage for managers, but we have persistently refused (except in one extreme case) to take over the managers' duties and responsibilities. After the experience we have had, and after prolonged consideration of the matter, I would formulate my own conclusion thus: that it would not be wise, or economical, or effective, for every diocese to do as we have done, *i.e.*, to set up its own school clearing house. Not wise, I say, for I do not believe the forty or fifty men can be found to work such to the best advantage; not economical, for the cost of these forty centres will be very considerable; not effective, for the dealings being direct with the department, any secretary-in-charge who may happen to live at a distance from London will be most seriously handicapped. At the first I was of opinion that this work might well be undertaken for all England by the National Society. Then, certain objections being raised, I suspended my own judgment for a time; but I have come round to my original standpoint, and I believe that, with a strong man at the helm, a "voluntary schools' clearing house" at the National Society's office could do yeoman's service. It is the ancient story of the bundle of sticks. The routine work of review and copying could be done at one centre for less than a tithe of the cost of the work if divided among many centres; the secretary-in-charge would, of necessity, be in immediate touch with "My Lords," and the managers would be represented at the Education

Department, whenever it were needed, by a skilled expert already on the spot, having the whole record before him, having the whole matter at his fingers' ends. On the other hand, every difficulty which could be more advantageously dealt with by the Diocesan Committee, or by the local managers, would be at once remitted to them together with marginal notes, giving the law on the point, and adding any departmental rulings in like cases. This is the method of the Education Department itself. Principles and new points are settled at headquarters; local detail is remitted to the local inspectors. Why, in the name of common sense, cannot the Church learn the lesson? All this may be had now; it needs no fresh legislation. I believe that two-thirds of the Church school managers, if appealed to by the bishops, would at once co-operate with the National Society in the effort to establish such a scheme of Federation, the very essence of which is non-interference with local discretion and local control. The National Society can look back on a splendid record; will it recognize the greatness of its present opportunities, and will it risk boldly a new departure? If it will, then I am sure that it will at once be brought into touch with our schools with a closeness of which none hitherto have dared to dream. Some will raise the cry of "money"—this is the lack of faith. English Churchmen will not allow any real work to languish for want of funds; the oversight of such an organization might well be endowed with a canonry at Westminster. There are many other points which have, perforce, been passed unnoticed in this hasty review, but rather than attempt to produce them, I have, for the sake of the Congress, preferred to deal with one thing at a time.

(3) The Report of the Archbishops' Committee.

The Rev. Joseph J. Scott, Rector of S. Clement's, Salford; and Hon. Canon of Manchester.

The Archbishops' Education Committee was appointed by the Archbishops in response to a resolution passed by a meeting of representatives from the various dioceses of England and Wales, which was held at the National Society's Office on November 22nd, 1893. The resolution was: "That the consideration of the present condition of the Voluntary schools be referred to a Committee to be appointed by the Archbishops."

The committee met for the first time on April 18th, 1894. They sent out several papers of enquiry to the bishops, to a number of leading Churchmen, and to all the organizing masters of Church Day School Associations.

The result of these enquiries showed that there was considerable pressure at the time on account of the demands made by the Education Department for improvements in school buildings; that in School Board districts the competition between Board schools and Voluntary schools was carried on upon such an unequal basis as to put the Voluntary schools in imminent peril; that in many non-school board districts also the claims for free education, under the Assisted Education Act of 1891, were causing a serious difficulty in regard to the maintenance of

Voluntary schools; and that throughout the country there was considerable alarm lest the voluntary system should no longer be able to hold its own, for the demands upon it were increasing year by year, and its resources were being diminished in towns and urban districts from the competition of Board schools and the loss of fees, while in country districts the falling incomes of the principal contributors and the increasing burdens upon them rendered it less easy to secure the same amount of voluntary assistance.

The committee were unanimous in agreeing that the Voluntary schools should not be given up. They advised Churchmen to demand the abolition of the 17s. 6d. and other limitations upon the grant earned, and the freeing of the school buildings from rates and taxes. Both of these reforms have since been advocated by the Association of School Boards. They also recommended further legislative facilities for the confederation of schools, *i.e.*, to enable the Church schools to help one another.

The report then discusses three important questions:—

(1) The Religious question.

(2) The Source of further Financial Aid.

(3) The School Board Veto upon so-called "unnecessary" schools.

(1) Many proposals have been brought forward as to the best method of dealing with the religious difficulty, but there are certain factors in the case that must be recognized in connection with any solution of this problem. The first of these is that the bulk of any religious instruction, to be given in a fairly satisfactory and regular manner, in schools of any size, must be given by the teaching staff of the school. All teachers and managers who have had experience in large schools are, I believe, agreed upon this. The second fact is that it is an unwritten law of School Boards (certainly of all the larger School Boards) that the religious opinions of a teacher should be no disqualification for his appointment. Now these two facts taken together render any such proposal as that of the Bishop of Salisbury, or any wholesale adoption of the German system of "simultan schulen," practicably impossible in England at present. And if the attempt were made, it is clear, from the attitude taken up on several occasions by the unsectarians, that it will be met by the united opposition of all the religious Nonconformist bodies, as well as that of the Secularist party.

The only course, therefore, that remains is to provide Church schools for Church children, and Roman Catholic schools for Roman Catholic children, for thus only is it possible to secure that the teachers shall be appointed with a real care for their religious influence and teaching as well as for their secular acquirements.

(2) The second question, which followed directly from this, was the question of additional financial support. The committee had before them every proposal for rate aid; for though the Roman Catholic scheme and Mr. Spottiswoode's were not published till later, they had under consideration a scheme that has not been published, but which embodied the principle of both these plans.

Now all rate aid schemes fall under one of two heads, either a subvention from the rates by the local authority, or the power to the ratepayer to allocate his share of the school rate to a particular school. It does not seem to me that the supporters of either of these proposals have

worked out their plans completely. To take the former case first: the most complete plan of this class is Mr. Spottiswoode's. I wish to avoid figures as far as possible, and will try to put the case without. It is assumed that the amount given from the rates is equal to the average per head amount given by School Boards to their own schools. This will, of course, involve paying School Board rates of salaries, in which case the amount will not suffice without subscriptions; in other words, to maintain the schools on the same level of efficiency as Board schools, the present subscribers must continue, and in some cases increase, their subscriptions, and pay at least half as much again in rates as they are paying to-day.

The "Manchester" scheme avoids this, and provides enough money, all out of the rates; but that, of course, means a still further increase of the rates and the loss of all the subscriptions.

Now, it has not been taken into account that, except the large cities, very few towns can afford such an increase to the local rates—the average increase in the rates throughout England would be sixpence in the pound—nor have the promoters, I think, fully weighed the immense injury such a course would have upon the position of the Church in the minds of the people. At present the Church is distinctly relieving the burden upon the people, but if either of these proposals became law, she would certainly be charged with increasing those burdens.

There is a further question: rate aid involves representative management. No plan has yet been proposed which does not leave the representatives of the Church in a minority upon the management. It is said that the rest must be "*bonâ fide* Churchmen," but what is a *bonâ fide* Churchman? Surely, any man may call himself a *bonâ fide* Churchman who is a citizen of this country. Any man can define for himself what that phrase means; and there is no legal definition which can be appealed to. I hope the Church of England will not allow the bodies of managers of her schools, that is, the true Church character of those schools, to be tampered with for money.

To turn to the allocation proposals; these, again, have never been worked out, and they are surrounded by difficulties of a totally different character. The only proposal of this kind that seems to me to be of much value is the proposal that subscribers to Voluntary schools should be exempted from their share of the rate for the maintenance of Board schools up to the amount of their subscription. But this proposal would not avail much by itself for poor schools in poor districts, though it might be of considerable value if coupled with increased aid from Imperial sources and Confederation.

Rate aid having thus failed to provide a safe remedy for our troubles, the Archbishops' Committee recommended an appeal for increased aid from the Imperial Government, such aid to go towards the teaching staff. This proposal has three great advantages. It would secure an adequate, proportionate, and fairly-paid teaching staff in every school; it would effectually eliminate competition between Board and Voluntary schools, in the only place where competition is of serious consequence; it earmarks the Government grant so that the managers are simply the paymasters, and therefore they have no opportunity of abusing public money—they must put it to the purpose for which it was intended—and thus it avoids the question of representative management.

Two or three methods of working this out have been already suggested : the National Society's Bill, which was published as an illustration of how it might work. This Bill was closely modelled upon the Irish system. Taken as a whole the Bill would have saved all Church schools, and the estimate was correct, for the amounts taken for the committee were calculated to provide in London, for each class of teacher, the average salary paid by the London School Board in their return for 1893, the latest date at the time available. Since the publication of the National Society's Bill, two or three calculations have been made, which show that the same principle could be worked out on the existing English lines. They work out thus :—

The Government grant (I mean the annual Parliamentary grant, as it is called, excluding the fee grant, but including the Science and Art grant) would consist of a large fixed grant per head, and a relatively small variable grant. The whole of these grants would have to be expended upon the teaching staff, and the managers would only be allowed to spend a certain sum per head in excess of these amounts. The excess sum would, of course, depend upon the amount of the grant. The Education Department in addition would have the right to fix a maximum as well as a minimum staff, so as to secure efficiency without extravagance or parsimony.

The limitation might be either a money limitation, as suggested above, or a staff limitation, or a limitation requiring a proper proportion of certificated to non-certificated teachers ; it would work equally well in both ways. This arrangement has been tested for all kinds of schools, and I make bold to say would enable even the poorest school to live, while at the same time it would leave managers and teachers free to make their own agreements with individual teachers, provided they keep within the maximum and minimum limits.

(3) The third point in the Bill is the liberty to open new schools, whether they be actually new schools or the resumption of old schools previously handed over to a Board, which would be technically reckoned as new schools. In the opinion of the committee, this is at present the only satisfactory solution of the religious difficulty, that is, to make religion one of the elements to be considered in deciding whether a school is necessary or unnecessary. There are some cases where the population is so small that this would not be possible. In such cases the religious difficulty might be entirely met by the school providing, for all children who are not withdrawn, teaching such as a Board school might give—Holy Scripture, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and then, in addition, giving to those children who claimed it the fuller Church teaching of the entire Catechism.

Lastly, whatever is done, should be done so as to enable the schools in rural districts not only to provide better teachers, and pay them better, but also to improve their curricula and provide more opportunities for their scholars.

What, then, may we hope for next Session? I think the Government should be pressed to remove all limitations upon the grants ; to exempt school buildings from all taxes and local rates ; to give us the Bishop of London's confederation clause, which will enable us to help ourselves, and at least some additional teaching staff grant.

The danger now is from our serious divisions among ourselves. Now,

as always, this is the peril of the Church of England. Last year this Congress asked the bishops for a policy. The bishops are agreed, and have given us a policy. I know this matter has been the subject of earnest prayer. I believe in the grace of Holy Orders. I believe myself that this is to a very large extent a matter which the bishops can judge better than the priests. Therefore, in conclusion, I venture to add my appeal to that of one of the most honoured members of the Archbishops' Committee, and to urge you to prayer, to real earnest prayer, that the rulers of this country may be guided and strengthened to adopt the course, not which you or I prefer, but which God knows to be the best for this Church and nation.

ADDRESSES.

(1) Preservation of Religious Education in Elementary Schools. (*a*) Voluntary. (*b*) Board.

The Rev. Joseph Nunn, Rector of S. Thomas's, Ardwick; and Hon. Canon of Manchester.

However much we may differ upon other matters, we are happily in this all agreed, that religious education must be preserved in our elementary schools. A secular system is intolerable. But to give each child its own special religious teaching in school hours is impossible. It has been suggested that the religious teaching should be given out of school hours by volunteers. This is impracticable. Mr. Hugh Price Hughes has recently said, "It is practically impossible for the Dissenting churches to provide adequate religious teaching in rural day schools." We may say that except in some favoured rural day schools, and in some small degree in town parishes, it is impossible for the Church to do it. We are thrown back, then, upon the Denominational system, or upon some common religious basis of instruction. The Denominational system was in sole possession up to 1870. Had Nonconformists done their part under it very little would have remained to be done. But they did not. The result was the Act of 1870, which has more than filled up the gaps, and has multiplied schools, chiefly on the old British school lines, practically having established a system of Nonconformist schools. These schools divide the country with the Denominational schools, and threaten to absorb them through their command of the rates. As these Board schools have multiplied, the inherent difficulties of a system of common religious instruction have become more apparent. If only that can be taught on which all are agreed, nothing can be taught. If the majority is to rule, then there is a liability to constant contention. Yet this is the only possible method of carrying on the work. The majority may hide their purpose and plan from themselves as well as from others. They may be ordered to put away their banners and watchwords, as is done by the Cowper-Temple clause. But the ruling and compelling power remains, and there may at any time be a struggle against it. Hence the common religious instruction of the Board school is, and must remain, an unstable system. Churchmen have recently received an invitation, well meant, but unauthorized, from a prominent Nonconformist, the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, to give up the sure foundation of their Denominational schools, and to come down to the common quicksand of the Board system. We shall be able, he in effect says, by our numbers, to compel the common use of the Apostles' Creed, and thus at least assert our common Christianity. If we were prepared to give up our schools as parochial

institutions, where the Christian pastor can best discharge his duty to the poor, and to make a present to the public of our school buildings, it would yet be impossible for us to accept Mr. Hughes' offer. We are obliged to refuse it for the sake of those very interests of vital religion which are dear to him as to us. Shall we leave the fatness of our olive tree to go to be promoted over the trees, when at any moment a fire may break out from some ill-favoured bramble which shall consume the whole of the forest? No! but we will make a counter proposal. Do you assist us frankly to obtain justice for our Church schools in School Board districts, that every Christian ratepayer may enjoy for his children the benefit of the rate he pays in the school of his choice, in accordance with the principles of religious liberty, and we, on our part, will engage that in no country school shall there be any semblance of religious oppression. The most scrupulous regard shall be paid to every man's conscience. While we claim the right to teach to all our own children whatever is found in our reformed Prayer-book, we do not impose this on others as a condition of receiving Bible instruction. We will meet every case in a frank and Christian spirit, and if at any time another temper be shown, those that display it are not of us, though they be with us. And if you further urge that the conscience of some will be offended by having to make money contributions through the rates to promote teaching which they don't agree with, we shall be ready to relieve your conscience by pointing out that we only take out of the common purse something less than we put in; and if conscience is still uneasy because your money has touched ours in the collector's bag, we shall be ready to make an easy arrangement, so that we may keep separate purses. Nay, more. Whether you will help us or not to obtain justice in School Board districts, these are our principles, and we stand by them. "We can do nothing against the truth but for the truth," and we claim the help of every Christian Nonconformist to secure the continuance of religious teaching in our day schools in the only certain way, *i.e.*, by the maintenance of the Denominational system. When this is destroyed, religious teaching in Board schools will be in the greatest jeopardy. With regard to our Voluntary schools our duty is plain. We must retain our liberty to teach in them the whole Prayer-book, while we don't forget what the Baptismal and Confirmation offices chiefly insist upon for young children, viz.: the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. Towards Nonconformists we have simply to observe the rule to do as we would be done by. But can nothing be done for Board schools? First, I think it a national disgrace that the rule which existed before 1870 was not continued, that the Bible should at least be read in every elementary school. But shall we seek the repeal of the Cowper-Temple clause? I think not. If it were repealed to-morrow, it would not make the slightest difference with the majority of School Boards, for they have invented far more stringent instructions of their own than are found in this clause. The House of Commons left the teachers free (and deliberately refused to do otherwise, by a large majority) to teach what they believe, so long as no formularies were used. But the School Boards have very largely adopted the substance of Mr. Jacob Bright's rejected clause, by which they would have been hampered by being ordered not to teach doctrines distinctive of any religious body. The best thing we can do is to maintain or restore the liberty of teaching which the Act of 1870 allows. He would be a poor teacher who could not find in the first four chapters of the Acts every article but one of the Apostles' Creed, and that he would find in the first chapter of S. Luke. We need not join hands with Mr. Hughes to bring the Apostles' Creed by name into our Board schools. It is there already. What our opponents desire is that the substance of it should not be taught. Only in this sense must we seek to "capture the Board schools," we must secure for them a full Scripture syllabus, suitable hymns and prayers, and, chiefly, Christian teachers. Here is the difficulty. Here is the

incurable weakness of the system. We must make the best of it. The people have a right to claim Christian teachers for their children. If a man cannot teach Christian doctrine, he is at liberty to say so. There is a conscience clause for scholars, so should there be one for teachers. But there must be perfect freedom of contract on the side of Boards and of teachers. If a man cannot teach the Christian religion, he may yet be employed for other subjects. Children are not to be brought up in ignorance of the Christian faith because some teachers have unhappily cast off their faith? But another question. Shall we seek for power to enter Board schools, in order to gain religious instruction? There is a danger in this if sought in schools built by School Boards. Not much could in practice come of it, but it would give an excuse to some Boards to imitate the Birmingham example, and it would certainly raise the question of Nonconformist ministrations in Church schools. If Board school children are to be taught Church doctrine out of school hours, let it be in a separate building. The case of a Church school transferred to a School Board is different; then the school ought to be re-transferred to the Church, provision made for Nonconformists, and the whole supported by the rates, as under the Manchester scheme. We have thus the conclusion of the whole matter. Upon the maintenance of the Denominational schools depends the continuance of religious education in elementary schools. Voluntary schools need help. This can, as a rule, be secured in most districts by a small additional grant to meet new requirements; by an extension of the principle of grants to small schools; by the abolition of rates and the removal of the local income limit. When a School Board is compelled by necessity to be formed, the transferred Church school should not lose its distinctive character, but provision should be made in it for Nonconformists. In School Board districts Church schools are rapidly losing ground. The remedy is to be found in securing for our schools their share in the local rates. This participation in the rates must not be allowed to affect the distinctive character of the school, or the security of the trust deeds. We do not wish to see any rate laid or any change effected in non-School Board districts. We ask for justice for ourselves. We ask our friends in country places not to seek to make our extremity their opportunity; not to make such demands or proposals as those contained in the Archbishops' report; not to hang upon our skirts or impede our movements while we strike a successful blow for religious freedom and Voluntary schools.

(3) The Report of the Archbishops' Committee.

S. Hoare, Esq., M.P., Cromer, Norfolk.

I have the honour of being the first layman to take part in this Congress. While I do so I realize the responsibility of my position. At the same time, as our lord bishop has said, one object of the Congress is to hear the views of the laity as well as of the clergy, and perhaps on this question I may speak with some special interest, seeing that sooner or later—perhaps very soon—these questions will have to be settled by the House of Commons. If, therefore, I go to some practical points, and look at the question from the position of a member of Parliament, I think you will probably like the course that I pursue, though I could have wished that some of my honourable friends now sitting on the platform, who are more experienced members of the House of Commons, and who are better qualified to speak on this question, were in my place. What is it, now, that we want? There are three points. The first is, that we maintain that religious instruction must be the foundation of the education

of our children; secondly, we desire that parents should have an opportunity of having their children brought up according to that denominational teaching which is in accordance with their own conscience; and, thirdly, we maintain that Voluntary schools, which are carried on at a saving of millions of pounds to the taxes and rate-payers of this country, should be treated with equal justice as the Board schools. I have not used the words "Church schools;" for, what we contend for in regard to the Church schools, namely, liberty granted to parents to have their children brought up according to the faith in which they believe; we contend also for other denominations, that they should have similar rights with us. In many districts the Voluntary schools are in difficulties, owing partly to the increased demands of the Education Department, partly to the poverty of the district; and in some cases, I am sorry to say—as I have experienced in my own parish—owing to people saying that School Boards are inevitable, and that it is no good putting off the evil day; and who, therefore, are unwilling to contribute. From these causes the Voluntary schools are suffering. But School Boards are not inevitable if Churchmen are true to themselves. How, then, are we to carry on our schools, when we are satisfied, as we are, that Church schools and Voluntary schools are not treated with the justice they deserve, and with the measure of support which the Board schools obtain?

There are numerous suggestions which have been made in connection with agricultural depression with which all of you cannot but sympathize at the present time. There have been as many with reference to Voluntary schools. But there is one point which we may keep before us, and that is, that we should endeavour to work together in union with those other bodies who are also great supporters of Voluntary schools. We must look to the Roman Catholics. With what loyalty they have stuck to their schools, not giving any of them up. We must look also to our other friends, and endeavour to strengthen each others hands, and avail ourselves of their support and help, in order that we may carry forward something which may be decisive for the future welfare of our Voluntary schools. I come now to our Church schools, and I would ask, Are they not worthy of support, when they are educating now 1,850,000 children, or, with the other Voluntary schools, three-fifths of the children of this country? Are we likely to let them go, or to give them up? No. We are thankful to the Archbishops for gathering together that committee whose report we are now discussing; and for summoning another conference to go further into this question, and see if there is some solution of the present difficulties. While desiring to support our schools, we wish not to be put to such a disadvantage by the Legislature that we cannot carry on those schools. The Archbishops' Committee has suggested three points. Upon the first we are all agreed, I think. It is not a large matter, but it is an irritating one, namely, that schools should be exempted from the payment of rates. That we have more than once proposed in Parliament, my friends and myself having introduced a Bill to that effect in the House of Commons. Then, I think, we all agree that the 17s. 6d. limit should be altered. That limit has told very hardly in our poorest districts, and especially in our rural districts; and that is a point, I think, upon which all Churchpeople are agreed. Then we come to the more important question, How are we to get that share of the public money to which we think we are entitled? Speaking personally—and, of course, we must all speak for ourselves—and speaking too for this part of the country which is now under such a cloud of agricultural depression, I would say that we cannot get this amount from the rates of the county or of the district; we must appeal for Imperial help, and for Imperial funds. The Archbishops' Committee suggests that this should be done by the alteration of the system of grants, and that the grants should be given for the payment of salaries, instead of as they are now given.

I have looked into this matter, and while I should be quite prepared to support it if the general body of the Church desired it and agreed to it, I do see certain objections to it. In the first place, I am not satisfied that if all our teachers became civil servants it would either be to their advantage or to the advantage of the managers of the schools with which they were associated. I find, and I am sure my hon. friends on the platform have often had experience of complaints from members of the Civil Service who were not satisfied with their position in this or that matter; and I doubt not that if teachers were made civil servants we should have those complaints multiplied to a great extent. As to the managers, I think the relations of the manager to the teacher would be made more difficult and hard to carry on if that suggestion were carried out. At the same time, speaking from the point of view of the teachers, I believe there would be advantages to them, and it might enable them to push on that scheme which they have so much at heart, namely, the scheme for securing pensions. But if we think that the Church schools would profit largely by such a change, I very much doubt it. If you take the balance sheets contained in the Report of the Education Department recently published, you will find that the fee grants and the annual grants come to about £6,500,000 a year, and the salaries of teachers to £6,995,000 for the same period, so that there is not a very large increase of grant to come from the Imperial Exchequer. And when you come to take the balance sheet of the Voluntary schools, and the balance sheet of the Board schools, you will find that the Voluntary schools will only get some £175,000, and the Board schools would get over £700,000 as their share in such an arrangement. I grant that one great point is that the salaries of the teachers would be raised, and that there would be a levelling up of salaries all round. This would very likely lead to a larger amount being given to the Voluntary schools; but I have made my calculation on the exact figures of the last return.

Well, if it were the desire of the great body of the Church, I would support such a proposal; but I am not sure that it is the wisest course. I think it would lead to difficulties, and I do not think it would lead to that advantage to the Voluntary schools which we have so much at heart. You may fairly ask what would I propose in its place? What would be my idea as to the best course to pursue? Well, I think myself—and I know it is a bold thing even to suggest—I think that another million sterling should be given from the Imperial exchequer for elementary education in this country; and the simplest and most feasible way of allocating it, and the way most likely to meet the support of the House of Commons, is to add an additional 5s. to the fee grant. That would make rather over a million; and in defence of this proposal, I would say that I think that when the fee grant was settled at 10s., Sir William Hart Dyke settled it at too low a figure. The average fee in the schools at that time was 11s. 3½d. That was in 1891; and if you go back to 1882, the average fee was 11s., and the expenses were £1 14s. 6¾d. Now the expenses are nearly 4s. more, and yet we in the Voluntary schools are still only receiving 10s. Of course you may say the average ought to have been 11s. or 11s. 6d., but even with that the expenses are still 3s. 6d. more. Therefore I think the increase of the fee grant to 15s. would probably tend to relieve a great deal of the burden of the Voluntary and Church schools. We must remember that we are educating three children out of every five of school age in this country, and so we should get a larger portion of the money where it is most required. Our share of the increase that I have suggested would be £630,000 or £640,000, and the Board schools would get considerably less, about £400,000. Personally, therefore, I would venture to suggest that that is a matter which those who are in authority ought to consider.

I am glad that this Congress is honoured to-day by the presence of the Minister on whom the responsibility of dealing with this question will rest. I realize that it is

a question which, if it is to be settled, must be settled at once. We are many of us supporters of a Government who are pledged to settle it. But the future of the Church schools, after all is said and done, does not rest with us in the House of Commons—it does not rest with legislation; we cannot fortify them for the great work they have to do merely by law. It is only by the support of the self-denying and conscientious efforts of Churchmen and Churchwomen that the Church schools can be made a reviving power. Let this Congress, then, be united in this, if in no other thing; let them be agreed that it is by their own individual effort, and determination to support them, that these schools can be made and kept the glory of our country, and a vast blessing to our people; and I trust so vast a blessing, that other countries may look at us, and those also who do not agree with us from a Church point of view, and may see that England is indeed indebted to these Voluntary schools; indebted to them for preserving the liberty of parents to bring up their children with such a religious education as they deem right. We Churchmen in our day and generation may then be thankful to have taken our share, however small, in so vast and great a work.

DISCUSSION.

HENRY LEE WARNER, Esq., Swaffham, Norfolk.

I WISH to say a few words in favour of the Church adopting a more sympathetic attitude to School Boards, at any rate in this diocese and in the rural districts, though I also wish that the area of a School Board district embraced more than one parish. We have at last a definite parliamentary return which enables us to deal with the statistics of religious education. It appears that of some seven hundred and forty parishes in Norfolk, one hundred and forty-four have School Boards, of whom all enforce the study of the Bible, only twelve adding the invidious limitation that it should be without comment. I implore Churchmen to realize the gain to the parishes at present relying on a voluntary rate only, to Board schools, to the Church, and to the whole community that would arise if we made the Board school the rule, the Voluntary school the exception. The gain to the Church-school parishes! This is shortly put. Education is being starved in order to keep it in the hands of the Church. We should have better accommodation and a more liberal staff of teachers, if what has been called "the intolerable strain" were removed. An arrangement by which the Church says to the ratepayers, "I will guarantee you against more than a two-penny rate, if you will leave me free in my position," must result and does result, in most of our parishes discouraging our higher standards and filling the overcrowded dens of unlicensed schools. But again, the gain to the Board schools will be greater, even if less perceptible. There is a tendency at present to regard Board schools as secular only. In spite of the fact that they all enforce the teaching of the Bible, they are often spoken of by men who should know better as godless. Think what we are doing by encouraging this view. The Church has the training of nine-tenths of the teachers, and should do nothing to lower their position. I have been a schoolmaster myself, and I know what my position would have been if I had been forbidden to teach the Bible, while another was entrusted with the moral and religious training of my pupils. The Church should take as much interest in Boards as any other citizens. They are an institution of the country; they are largely officered by Churchmen, who thereby attain a unique position. Yet you slander them. It is the duty of the Church to support them; it is her policy too. The exclusiveness of the clergy has often failed to enlist people of all classes in Church work. In this work, above all others, we want the co-operation of all classes. We want to enlist the parents on the side of discipline, to bring home responsibility to them, to make the most of their civic life. To quote the words of the Bishop of London in the report of 1867, "The result of confining the governorship to Churchmen has often been to create a spirit of hostility against the school in the minds of those whose support would aid its prosperity." What is true of the governorship of our secondary schools is even more true of the management of our elementary schools. And, if in teaching our clergy to co-operate with all good citizens, we also relieve their purses—well! I have tried to

collect for the Church House in this diocese, and I have tried to push the C. E. T. S. so as to have a branch in every parish, and I know that money is not too plentiful. Let me conclude in John Keble's words, "Where persons oppose each other honestly, however decidedly, in belief or opinion, the cause of truth, which commonly lies between both, or of charity, without which even truth itself can scarcely be maintained truly, is greatly served by the softening and enlightening necessity of personal and official communion." I know that in what I have said I am but advocating the cause we all have at heart—the cause of reunion.

J. G. TALBOT, Esq., M.P. for Oxford University.

IT is only by your command, my Lord Bishop, that I address this Congress for a very few moments. I feel, in the first place, that it is rather embarrassing to follow the speech of Mr. Warner without giving it first respectful consideration, and also a rather elaborate answer. That, however, is impossible in the time at my disposal. I quite recognize the desirability of working as far as possible with the Nonconformists in all the works in which they sympathize with us and we with them. But I do not think that anything would be gained by surrendering our own principles; and I think the Nonconformists themselves would be the very first to despise us if for the sake of what would seem to them a hollow union we were to surrender the principles on which the Church schools were founded. These schools were founded many years ago by pious Churchmen for the purpose of imparting to the young the doctrines of the Church by religious education, with good secular instruction. Therefore, we are not at liberty, I think, to break the trust we have inherited from those who have gone before. In saying that, I hope I shall not be suspected of wishing to oppress Nonconformists in the least degree. If there are a substantial number of parishes in this diocese in which Nonconformists are a large and powerful factor, special arrangements should be made for the instruction of the children of those Nonconformists; and I myself would be perfectly willing that the Nonconformist teachers should take part in the religious instruction of the children belonging to their religious denomination if their parents desire it. But I observe that, while we hear these objections to Church teaching in the abstract, when we come to the concrete we do not find that they frequently exist; and when we come to deal with facts we find that Nonconformists are quite willing to send their children to Church schools to receive religious teaching there. Where they are not willing to do so, I should be anxious that any arrangements should be made that could be made to meet their conscientious convictions. While, therefore, I differ from Mr. Warner in many of his conclusions, I do not differ from the spirit of proper conciliation which he advocated, and which I should be very glad to support. Would you allow me to say a few words on the very great subject which is before us to-day, because I do feel that this is a supremely important moment for Churchmen on this great question of elementary education? I should not be so bold as to invent a panacea, or to say that I have a plan for solving the question. I very much agree with what Mr. Hoare has said. I think there is a great deal to be said for his view of the question, and before we rush into any scheme we ought thoroughly to consider it, and see the objections to it as well as the advantages we think can be derived from it. An important movement is taking place whilst we speak. Not only has the Archbishops' Committee reported, but at this very moment a private conference is sitting in London, summoned by His Grace, of gentlemen interested in the matter, and who are considering what measures they should themselves suggest to give effect to the demands which Churchpeople are making for themselves; and, secondly, to see whether they can elaborate any plan which they could submit to other religious bodies as a means of concordant action with them. I think that is a very important sign, as showing that people are grasping the very point to which I ask your attention this afternoon. That point is this, we have at the present moment a unique opportunity. The majority of the House of Commons is pledged to the support of the Voluntary schools, and that is a condition of things we have never had before. We have had a majority in favour of the Voluntary schools in the House of Commons, but never a House of Commons in which the majority has gone thither fresh from the constituencies pledged that they would support the Voluntary schools. If the constituencies will keep their members up to the promises they made at the hustings—I made none, and so they cannot keep me—

you will find that with a majority so pledged we have a unique opportunity. In the second place, many members of the Government have expressed themselves in support of these schools. I hope in the presence of Lord Cranborne that I may say even the head of the present Government is pledged to it, and the leader of the party in the Lower House has declared that it is not only just, but urgent, that something should be done for those schools. These two things being so—(1) the majority of the House of Commons, and (2) the Government being pledged to the support of Voluntary schools—would it not be the height of infatuation if Churchmen were to throw away such an opportunity as this? What I ask you, therefore, is, that whatever scheme your leaders in the Church and your leaders in Parliament agree upon, that scheme you, I hope, will earnestly support. I much prefer State aid to rate aid; but I would rather take rate aid, which I dislike, than throw away this opportunity of doing something for our Voluntary schools. The opportunity may not recur; but whether it recurs or not, we ought to do this work at once, because the education of the children of the poor is the kernel of the whole question for us, and upon it depends whether this nation in the future shall be a Christian nation or not. It rests with you, and upon us all, that we shall not throw away the opportunity thus set before us.

The Very Rev. Wm. Lefroy, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

I would like to call your attention to the inordinate amount of anxiety, worry, and stress to which numbers of the parish priests of England are being put constantly by the demands made for alterations in the fabrics of their schools. I have not a word to say against these fabrics being brought up to the highest point of excellence. Unless they are efficient they ought not to exist. We have no desire to bolster up a decaying educational system, but our Voluntary school system is not a decaying system. It, however, needs justice, fair-play, and that sympathetic treatment which, if Mr. Forster had been alive to-day, he would have been the first to demand for it. Why should we not, then, try to create a public opinion in this direction, and secure that when a school has been enlarged or improved it shall receive a certificate, so that it shall not be required to be enlarged or improved for, say, three years, except at the Government expense. I know of cases where improvements have been made in one year, and discredited in another year by a different inspector. I would also call attention to the distress caused to the clergy by the vexatious, oppressive, and unjust reports made upon Voluntary schools by Her Majesty's Inspectors. I do not mean to say that they are all unjust or inimical, but I have heard that some reports are unfair. Perhaps the inspector was not well. His liver, probably, was deranged; or he had had a bad night; he was stern, and the poor children went shivering before him. I do not say that inspectors are intentionally unkind, but they have livers, and I think that when the reports are of this vexatious character there should be an educational court of appeal to which the managers of the schools could go. Whether these points are accepted by you or not, I say, let us, in this great crisis of our Church's history, resolve to a man, that not one Church school shall be handed over to the School Board. We have the confidence of the nation, we have the sympathy of the poor, we have the well-being of the whole country at heart, and we should see that the children are taught that without which education is hardly worthy of the name—a definite distinct, and dogmatic religion.

ASSEMBLY ROOM.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. BISHOP BARRY in the Chair.

THE CHURCH'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS

(1) SOCIALISM.
(2) TRADES UNIONISM.
(3) CO-OPERATION.

PAPERS.

The Rev. M. KAUFMANN, M.A., Rector of Ingworth and Vicar of Calthorpe, Norfolk.

DEMOCRACY has been called a many-headed monster. This Congress only takes into account three heads; and the first of these is Social Democracy, *i.e.*, Socialism in its organized form, professing to represent the *social* aspirations and aims of Democracy. It tries at this moment to capture and absorb Trades Unionism, which till lately was only a combination of workers to secure the rights of their class in dealing with employers. It scorns the feeble attempts of co-operators to carry on industry independently of capitalists, though on capitalist principles. It aims at no less than the abolition of both the capitalist and the employer, as a class; in fact, the abolition of classes in society altogether. It proposes to substitute a state of society in which the whole people in its collective capacity assigns to each person the amount of work to be done according to individual capacity, and allots to each a proportionate amount of enjoyment out of the common fund. This is Collectivism, the community as a whole delegating its powers to a governing body, elected by universal suffrage, whose duty it would be to collect all the industrial forces towards one common object—the good of society, to collate all social functions for the promotion of social progress, to consolidate the social edifice on a perfectly equitable basis.

The social pyramid with its base at the top would stand on its apex, *or*—it would fall. That is not likely, say the advocates of socialism, for "Democracy means administration by the competent." If that be admitted our attitude is plain; we must simply try the experiment and submit to the change. But there is ample room for doubting whether such a governing body, or committee of management, called into office by a popular vote, and in danger of being re-called when incurring popular displeasure, would be a safe authority to be entrusted with the whole business of society. The collective wisdom of such a body, selected by the collective wisdom of the community, might possibly not suffice for the task. Even the collective wisdom of the nation in parliament, of the clergy in Convocation, of smaller bodies in county councils, parish councils, aye, the collective wisdom of our capitular

bodies, the collective wisdom of this very Church Congress, are apt at times to be called in question. But granted the competency within certain limits there are the possible dangers of public coercion stifling individual enterprise and of public corruption affecting private interests. Such things are not unknown in countries under the sway of "triumphant democracy."

But, replies the socialist, we may try, and we must, for things could not be worse than they are under the existing social system. What could be worse than the incompetency and corruption of the ruling class now? Do not the great capitalists in land and money greedily devour small trades and small farms? Is it not the tyranny of capital which degrades the wage-labourer into a slave of the machine? Does not the lust of gain defraud the workman of a considerable share of his hire? Is it not a fact that every commercial crisis resulting from unprincipled over-production renders employment uncertain, and a livelihood precarious? Is not work carried on in factories and workshops at all times monotonous and depressing by reason of an excessive division of labour? Is not the labourer's sole property, *i.e.*, his power to work, entirely at the mercy of the enterprising capitalist, who turns it to his own profit after paying starvation wages fixed by the "higgling of the market"? Is it not thus that a formidable class of impoverished proletarians is rising up by the side of a diminishing number of a few plutocrats and landed proprietors? Is not the gulf between the masses and the moneyed few growing vaster and deeper daily? and is not the time coming nearer and nearer when the many will bear it no longer and the few will be at their mercy, when at last the expropriators will be expropriated, and the social revolution will put an end to the present state of things? Is it not the fear of this catastrophe that has suggested the palliatives recommended by social reformers, and partly carried out by social politicians? Is it not the recognition of existing social evils which has called forth the generous protest of Christian socialists, so-called because of their appeal to Christian principles for the purpose of lessening or removing existing social evils?

There is a great deal of truth in all this, and it is our duty to look at both sides of the question in defining our attitude towards socialism :—

I.—In the first place, then, I would say the attitude of the Church must be that of *reserve*. It is easy to be carried away by sentiment. Bitter cries are raised from this or that suffering section of society, and nothing is more natural for generous natures than to be carried away by popular cries, and nothing more tempting to others than to pander to popular passions. But the experience of religious reformers, like Luther, and of social reformers like Lamennais, in the past, as well as the experience of the Irish and French priesthood of the present, alike discourage such indiscriminate siding with popular demands in the endeavour of leading democracy. For in such a case the religious leader is apt to be pushed on too far by those behind him, or to be pushed aside unceremoniously if he does not go fast enough and far enough for his followers. It is our duty to inquire whither social democracy will lead us, what are its moving principles, what is *its* attitude towards *us*, and how it affects spiritual interests? Social Democracy professes indifference in matters of religion, but practically it is anti-Christian. The Grand Municipal Council of Paris,

said Jules Simon a few years ago, is "The Grand Council of Collectivism," and, he added, "the majority is against God and capital." This, I may add, is true of social democracy everywhere with some exceptions. It is materialistic in its philosophical tendency. Its ethic is founded on the social instincts of animals. The professed aim of its more outspoken leaders is the "De-Christianization of Society." "Atheistic humanism," says one of its English representatives, "is the proper religion of collectivism." The attitude of socialism towards religion and the Church is therefore on the whole unfriendly. It would, if it could, uproot the spiritual foundations on which society rests. For this reason a well-known German divine in a rescript to the Evangelical Social Congress not long ago warned its members to be extremely cautious in their attitude, since, as he put it, on that attitude will in a great measure depend the future development of the Church.

II.—On the other hand, our attitude must not be that of cautious reserve alone; it should also be, as far as possible, an attitude of ready and intelligent *sympathy*, though never degenerating into sympathetic attitudinizing. We have been accused of being "deserters from social duty" in our quest of the soul's salvation. The charge should be forcibly rebutted. With some of the aspirations of socialism we have warm sympathies. As a protest against the selfishness of the age, it commands our highest respect. We, too, say that society must be saved from selfishness. The principle of solidarity claimed by socialism as against individualism lies at the very root of Church organization. The Church is a society for the promotion of righteousness, righteous dealing in our social relations not excluded. Nay, in this we are more socialistic than the socialists themselves. We believe in the all-sufficiency of the principle of association in "the unity of the spirit," and for that very reason put not our faith in a mere mechanical rearrangement of society such as they propose. It is not by new measures, but by men renewed within, that any important social changes can be effected. Schemes of social amelioration must depend for their success on the improvement of the individual character. If society is to be re-constructed on the principle of Fraternity, it must not be the fraternity of Abel and Cain, "be my brother or I will kill thee!" But when brotherly love, as taught in the Epistles of S. John, shall animate every member of society, and Christian sympathy shall form the link between the social units, the character of the social system which holds them together will be a matter of comparatively small importance. Therefore, in the words of one whose supremacy in matters ecclesiastical we deny, but whose superior wisdom in social politics we readily admit, "Christian society, above all things, must be re-organized according to God's will, re-commencing actively its course according to the Divine plan. This must be its heart and centre if those social maladies are to cease against which we are fighting."

III.—In the next place our attitude ought to be one of rigid *criticism* of the methods of socialism, not necessarily one of downright opposition, still less that of temporizing opportunism. No colour should be given to the libel that we are a sort of "sacred gendarmerie," in pay of a State Church, to keep the masses in a state of social subordination. Nor should the advice tendered by injudicious friends entice us into the use of priestcraft, embracing a popular cause for the sake of saving the

Establishment. But, guided by the white light of pure reason, and warmed into a lively zeal for a righteous cause, we should consider cautiously, not coldly, but calmly, and without fear or favour, every proposal for the social amelioration of the class which is at once the most numerous and the most dependent on the collective action of the Church and nation. Such measures, for example, as the compulsory construction of healthy dwellings at a low rental; the free maintenance of children in school whose parents are hopelessly destitute or vicious; legislative enactments for the efficient protection of female and child labour in the factory and the field; measures for shortening the hours of labour for all so as to increase opportunities for healthy recreation and culture; legislation for shifting the burden of taxation from the shoulders of those who are least able to bear it to those who can and ought; the acquisition by the State or the Municipality of some of the public services now in the hands of railway, gas, and water companies; reforms in the ownership and occupation of the soil, and a system of National Life Insurance, making due provision for old age and infirmity—such measures, I say, put forward by socialists as palliatives in their programmes should receive a candid and careful consideration. But throughout it should be borne in mind that in no case could the welfare of society, in its collective capacity, be secured without some sacrifice on the part of persons interested, that without the spirit of sacrifice in the social units the harmonious working of the united body would be rendered impossible, that no social system of mutual action and reaction can be made to work well unless the force of mutual attraction is strengthened, and that of mutual repulsion is weakened by a high sense of devotion to social duty. Socialism and Individualism are not alternate systems, one of which has to be adopted and the other rejected; they are social principles, each having their place in the ordering of society. Collectivism is not a substitute for, but a co-efficient of, Individualism. The autonomy of conscience, which we as Christians must uphold, is bound up with individualism; corporate union, which subordinates individual claims to the common good, is the foundation principle of a Church. The social problem of the hour is not how to re-construct society, but how to reconcile individual freedom with social union—personal rights with those of the community in order to reform it.

IV.—But whilst we attach more importance to the working out of principles than the formulation of systems, our attitude should be none the less that of resolute *action;* as Churchmen we must be practical in addressing ourselves to this problem. The clergy and laity have all personal relations to maintain, as employers towards employed. As ministers of religion in their official capacity they have some influence over both in spreading correct views on social subjects, in displaying a high sense of social justice; inculcating and practising mutual toleration and forbearance between class and class; discouraging a greedy, self-seeking spirit. Moreover, by encouraging a spirit of Christian self-abnegation, by promoting a more general mixture of the different grades of society, on the principles of Christian fellowship; last, but not least, by a clearly defined expression of Church opinion on the social problem by the recognized organs of the Church as represented in Convocation, or conference, they may do much towards the solution of the problem. By means of clearly and authoritatively

defining the attitude of the Church they may do much to silence the voice of prejudice and slander of her enemies, and also avert dangers arising from injudicious and irresponsible utterances of her friends.

In all this the Church of England may learn a lesson from her rivals as to what is worthy of imitation and what has to be avoided. From the Church of Rome she may learn to avoid a too easy accommodation to the levelling down tendencies of the day, and a too ready aggressiveness in her attitude towards secular governments and the ruling classes in the name of the people. From the same Church she may learn, too, the lesson of organizing her members in every section of society, in the centres of industry more especially, so as to withdraw them from the influence of socialistic agitation; to bring all under Church influence, and to give the principle of association a religious consecration. The appointment of ladies' committees to form associations among females of the working classes in the Church of France is here specially to be commended. From the Church of Humanity we may learn how to avoid the fallacy of extremes, as when its founder in his dislike of individualism says that the real life is the collective life of the race, that the individual is only an abstraction, or when, in direct opposition to the democratic spirit of the age, Comte commits the supreme power in his ideal society to a patriciate of priests and philosophers. At the same time, positivists teach us the lesson of spreading right social views among the masses by a widely extended system of educating adults by lectures and classes, conducted by men of high mental and moral calibre, on the principle that the solution of the industrial problem is an intellectual, a moral, a religious question; that a change of habits, opinions, and tastes, must precede any attempt to re-organize industry.

. Lastly, in taking up a decided attitude towards Social Democracy one thing has to be shunned above all things on our part, and that is an attitude of reaction, an attitude which, next to inaction, is perhaps the most congenial to the clerical mind. At this juncture social democracy is under a passing cloud. It has been lately defeated in electoral contests both on French and English soil. But such temporary discomfitures in the history of the movement have led again and again to the false idea that prostration after over-excitement, or exhaustion after over-strained exertion, means extinction. The late defeat of the independent labour party in this country, and that of the socialists in France, are no proof that the demand for "an industrial commonwealth founded upon the socialization of land and capital" has been swept aside by a popular vote on both sides of the channel. The march of democracy has been slightly arrested because it became a forced march, too quick for some of its followers. It will be resumed with renewed vigour after a temporary collapse, and we must be prepared for it. Now is the time to show our real sympathy and a cheery readiness on the part of the Church to support any proposals put forward to satisfy the just demands of democracy, or attempts made in the legislature to give them effect. It is better to lead than follow unwillingly; to conduct the movement into safe channels, than to try to stop its course. It is well, also, to trust in so doing in the final fulfilment of a Divine plan in the progress of the movement; to breathe into it a Diviner spirit; to infuse into it a wisdom derived from a Diviner source, so that in the

further development of the democratic movement, by Divine permission the voice of the people may become, indeed, the voice of God.

(2) Trades Unionism.

The Very Rev. Charles William Stubbs, D.D., Dean of Ely.

The fundamental characteristic of modern democracy, whose relation with the Church we are met to consider to-day, is that it is an *industrial* democracy, and an industrial democracy which not only is organized socially on the principle of *free* labour, but which politically has fully accepted the principle of *representative* government. Modern democracy is in fact an industrial democracy and a representative democracy, and is differentiated by those two facts from all other democracies of which we read in history. I am not, therefore, departing from the instructions of my brief—which is endorsed with the sub-title of Trades Unionism—if I commence by reminding you that those two facts—the free industrial basis, the representative principle of government—absolutely throw out of court as irrelevant and ridiculous all interested appeals to the fate of democracies in other ages and other intellectual and social periods of the world's history. When the actual facts of history are detached from the illusory phrases with which they are too often concealed, it will be found that the fate of such ancient states as the democratic Republics of Greece or Rome, or of the mediæval Republics of Italy, which so long has been the pet bugbear of the political thinker and the belated practical politician, is in no sense due to the principle of democracy at all, but to social conditions, as of war or of slavery, which certainly are not necessarily associated with that principle. There is, in fact, no historical precedent of modern democracy.

Those of you who have been reading lately Mr. Benjamin Kidd's striking, if somewhat too infallible, book on "Social Evolution," will remember that that is the final lesson which the concluding pages of his book are devoted to impressing upon his readers. "The fact," he says, "of our time which overshadows all others is the arrival of democracy. But the perception of the fact is relatively of little importance if we do not also recognize that it is a new democracy. There are many who speak of the new ruler of nations as if he were the same idle democracy whose ears the dishonest courtiers have tickled from time immemorial. It is not so. Even those who attempt to lead him do not yet quite understand him. Those who think he is about to bring chaos instead of order do not rightly apprehend the nature of his strength. They do not perceive that his arrival is the crowning result of an ethical movement in which qualities and attributes which we have all been taught to regard as the very highest of which human nature is capable find the completest expression they have ever reached in the history of the race."

This conception of democracy, the path of whose evolution is to be traced along the line of what is good for societies, and not by the consideration of what is good only for individuals, and the consequent recognition of religion as the *ultra rational* basis of any stable society, of any society, indeed, whose ultimate ideal is to bring all the people

into the rivalry of life on conditions of equality, is the doctrine you remember which Mr. Kidd enforces with so much freshness and brilliance of argument through many chapters of his book. It is a doctrine, however, which those of us who have been familiar with the writings of Joseph Mazzini—the great Italian patriot and political saint of modern democracy—have for the last twenty years been endeavouring to impress upon our fellow Churchmen. Until lately, we have met with but little sympathy. It is perhaps not surprising. To many men, the name of democracy has seemed to have no meaning but such as "the guillotine surmounted by the red cap" could suggest. To many men, as to Coleridge, the voice of democracy has been for many a day a *Vox Diaboli* rather than a *Vox Dei*. To many, even the coarse saying of Bismarck the other day, that "Democratic principles are the filthy ferment of South German immorality," hardly seems exaggerated. To still more the association of the word *Church* with *democracy* seems almost blasphemy, for what, such men say, has the Church to do with polling-booths, and ballot-boxes, and committee rooms, and election placards, and voting registers, and representative assemblies from the parish council to the House of Commons? To such men, Mazzini's language about democracy seems absurd—worse than absurd.

Yes, but when Mazzini and his modern disciples in England to-day speak of democracy, they understand by that term a vastly different and an infinitely wider thing than ever enters into these men's minds. To us, democracy is a page of the world's history written by the finger of God. As a permeative spirit, a living principle, it works in the lives of men and of nations. As such, in due season it bears its fruit. "When all men," Mazzini said, "shall commune together in reverence for the family and respect for property, through education, and the exercise of a political function in the State—the family and property, the fatherland and humanity, will become more holy than they are now. When the arms of Christ, even yet stretched out on the Cross, shall be loosened to clasp the whole human race in one embrace—when there shall be no more pariahs, nor Brahmins, nor servants, nor masters, but only men—we shall adore the great name of God with more faith and love than we do now."

This is democracy in its essentials, and if we shrink from the passion of Mazzini's utterance and the sacred allusion of his words, at least let us remember that it was of this greater thing that he had to speak, and let us set ourselves to do for England what he tried to do for Italy—to bring democracy into close touch with Christianity. This, at least, as it has always seemed to me, is one of the greatest of the practical problems before the Church of England to-day. How far can the Church of Christ, as we know it to-day in England, as the interpreter of life in the light of the Incarnation, satisfy the social needs of the English people? Can it supply not only an ideal of conduct for the individual, but an ideal of discipline, of government, of civilization for the society? Is democracy that ideal, or can it be made so? To those of us who are sufficiently in earnest in our belief in God and the establishment of His kingdom on earth, that we cannot bear to think that any part of human life lies outside the Divine plan, the answer, as far at any rate as the civil administration of the State is concerned, will not long be doubtful.

For the facts of daily life will force us to acknowledge that the principle of equality, equality of consideration, upon which democracy is based, is not widely and powerfully swaying the modern mind without justification. Democracy, it is true, is not of necessity, and under every condition of society, the best form of government, and may, indeed, be the worst of all possible governments, but it can only be so through the perversion of powers which ought to make it the best of all possible governments. The rule of the few may sometimes be better than the rule of the many, for the few may be fit, and the many unfit; but that in itself is a vast misfortune. Moreover, a government in which any class of the people has no share, is almost certain to be a government unjust or ungenerous to that class of the people, and, therefore, a bad government. Inasmuch, therefore, as the Christian definition of life implies for each of us a struggle, not only for our own selfish good, or for the good of any class, but for the common good of all, so for the Christian the democratic ideal must at least be the ultimate goal, for it means the good government of all, through the association and the co-operation of all, in the Spirit expressed by the words of Christ Himself: "Whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister, and whosoever of you will be chiefest let him be servant of all . . . for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."

And what is true in politics, true of the civic administration of a State, is probably true also in economics in the administration and distribution of national wealth. Take an illustration from Trades Unionism.

It was my fortune a few weeks ago to sit up into the small hours of the night discussing with one of the leading shipbuilders of the world the problem of Trades Unionism. Our talk began with my friend's indignant denunciation of a projected strike in his shipyard, which he represented as absolutely and wickedly unjustifiable. Briefly, the facts appeared to be these: A great Atlantic liner had lately been within a few weeks of completion. His firm was under contract to deliver the ship to their customers in Liverpool by a certain date. Through many months all the great departments of the yard, with their many associated trades, shipbuilders, carpenters, boiler-makers, iron-moulders, pattern-makers, fitters, engineers—had been in full work. Thousands of men—there are nearly ten thousand men employed by that one firm—during that time had received full and fair wages. There was not the slightest indication of any dissatisfaction in any of the trades. A fortnight more of steady work and the steamer would be ready for delivery. But there was no margin of time to spare. The shipowners in Liverpool advertised the public that the steamer would sail for her first trip to New York on a given day. Immediately on the publication of the advertisement, the Trades Union authorities demanded, under threat of a strike, a ten per cent. increase in the rate of wages. The builders were driven into a corner, and the men knew it. The owners in Liverpool telegraphed that the ship must be ready to fulfil her advertised engagement to sail on a given day, at whatever cost. Under compulsion the demand of the men was granted.

"But," exclaimed my friend, "do you call that fair play? Is any honest business possible under such tyranny? In these days of fierce competition, when contracts are forced down to the lowest margin of profit, what issue can there be of such action other than permanent loss

of trade to the country?" He gave me many more instances drawn from his long and wide experience of the evil side of Trades Unionism. I could not but sympathize with his keen appreciation of the evil. But at the end of it all I remained a still more convinced supporter of the principle of Trades Unionism than ever. And for this reason: "Get down," as Carlyle used to say, "to the root of things, to the bedrock of the matter;" and what is the real secret of all this evil action? In a word, it is this. The workmen have lost trust in the masters; the masters have ceased to place confidence in the men. The workmen simply do not believe that under a system of absolutely "free contract" they can receive fair wages from the masters. The history of the labour movement during the last half century, as read by the men, conclusively proves, they think, that the individual labourer, the non-unionist workman, standing alone, and without a breakfast for himself or his family, is not in a position to make a fair bargain for wages with the capitalist employer, who can hold out as long as he likes, or hire other labour on the spot. To him the Trades Union is an absolute necessity of life.

And the masters, on their side, place no confidence in the men, or, to speak perhaps more accurately, the masters never take the men into their confidence. In other words, in the fixing of the wages of labour, capital recognizes no right on the part of labour to know any of the conditions of the bargain which fixes the cost price of the product of labour and capital. Capital is able thus always to compel wages to follow prices, not prices to follow wages, which, to labour, naturally seems the juster sequence.

How shall harmony be created between labour and capital in this respect? Here is the problem. There seems to me to be only two possible solutions to it.

I.—First, the conversion of both masters and men to Christianity, to such a practical consistency of faith and life in Christianity as, shall we say? that of Count Tolstoi. This is a simple solution, which I fear many people beside Mr. Benjamin Kidd would call *ultra rational.* It is a solution, however, which I need not perhaps ask you further to consider to-day, for although we are all of us agreed as to the duty of the Church of Christ in this relation, there are few of us who expect to see it realized.

II.—Secondly, such an organization of industry, in the first instance, by the fuller and the completer development of unionism among the men, and of federation among the masters, as shall allow of the formation for each trade of a representative board or council elected in each important industrial centre, by both masters and men, on a democratic basis of equality—equality of consideration—to which all questions of trade policy might be submitted.

The proposal is a very simple one. It is not even novel, for in some trades such boards already exist. Let me read you this piece of evidence; I take it from an article published some little time ago in *Engineering.*

"Passion and ignorance are the two great factors in all industrial conflicts, and they are not confined to either side. The truth of this is to be seen in the magnificent success of the wages board in the iron trade. Once, the Midlands were the scene of a constant succession of fierce and violent industrial conflicts; then the board was established, and now for twenty-two years there has not been a single strike. There

have been difficulties and sources of irritation in plenty; the North ot England Board has dealt, without a single stoppage, with two thousand questions, any one of which might have led to a rupture. When the board first met there were jealousy and suspicion on both sides—each thought the other unreasonable. But as acquaintance grew they both found that there were two sides to every question, and that often only one had presented itself to them. The result was that mutual respect was generated, and although differences of opinion were constantly present, they tended to grow less in the light of knowledge. . . . It must necessarily be a long time before a full knowledge of economic affairs penetrate the working classes, because that is a matter which employers feel it necessary to conceal, although the experience of the wages boards show that no harm need follow perfect candour as regards accounts, under reasonable restrictions."

In conclusion, therefore, I venture to impress upon my fellow Churchmen the duty of doing all they can to influence public opinion in favour of Trades Unionism, and its fuller and completer organization on a representative and democratic basis, as the industrial development, which, in the present stage of economic and social evolution, seems to offer the best prospect of social harmony in the future. What modern industrial democracy wants for the moment in England to-day is, I am convinced, not less combination, but more combination and further federation. The bigger, the more solid the union, the better for all concerned. Strong, sound Trades Unionism, based on the old principles of sound sense, justice, mutual self-sacrifice, loyalty, is not only, as I believe, the greatest safeguard of the workmen's interest, but it is also the best guarantee to the employer of the workmen's good faith, just as I believe a weak, spasmodic, disorganized, unprincipled combination on the part of either masters or men is one of the gravest of national dangers. And yet, I do also believe, that for modern democracy a nobler social ideal than even Trades Unionism, a more Christian economic order, does exist somewhere. God knows it and desires its adoption. It is for us, who pray daily "Thy Kingdom come on earth," to discover it and to try to establish it.

(3) Co-operation.

The Rev. C. T. Cruttwell, M.A., Rector of Kibworth, Leicester; and Rural Dean.

A generation ago it was usual for public speakers to congratulate the nation on the success of its social system. To this universal optimism the Church formed no exception. But now things are changed. The public mind is better informed, the public conscience is more sensitive. Men frankly confess that the splendid material results of the age have been purchased at the expense of much injustice, much undeserved suffering; and they call for social reforms which shall remove the one and atone for the other.

The Church, as the soul of the nation, throws herself with ardour into the campaign. To her the names of freedom, of brotherhood, of equality, have a historic, as well as a religious, significance. It was her

glory to have championed them in their first struggling life; she need not fear to stand by them now that they seem to have deserted her flag and at times to turn against her.

Nevertheless, if the Church and her clergy, dissatisfied with things as they are, identify themselves with schemes of which they either cannot foresee the issue, or only partly approve the principles, the loss to their ultimate influence will far outweigh the increase of present popularity. It is therefore necessary to understand as well as to feel; and not allow either a generous indignation or a generous partisanship to outrun the guidance of reason.

Competition is on its trial. It is being tried in the secular court on a charge of waste, of misappropriation, of failure; and it is being tried in the spiritual court on a charge of injustice, of oppression, of breach of brotherhood. And in its stead three substitutes are offered, different in their methods, but agreeing in their object of supplanting strife by peace, a rivalry of gain by a rivalry of service.

Two of these have already been discussed. The third, which is now before you, is co-operation. At the outset we must distinguish clearly between co-operation as an economic method and co-operation as a social ideal. Whatever may be its destined triumphs should it once prevail over the whole field of production—and co-operators may be pardoned if they pitch their hopes high—I propose in this paper to regard it strictly as a practical agency, and to estimate its title to our support, first, by its actual results, and secondly, by its moral basis.

Let us see, then, what are the facts with which we have to deal. What are the outward and visible signs of the co-operative movement? There were registered last year 1,674 separate societies, with a membership of 1,343.518, a share capital of £15,006,663, a trade of £49,985.065, and a net profit of £4,911,299. The vast majority of the above societies are retail stores, but about 170 are factories, engaged in the work of production.

This host of stores is supplied by two immense warehouses, the English and Scottish Wholesales, with their central offices at Manchester and Glasgow respectively. The Wholesales are owned by the societies, which, by a system of representation by delegates, control their management.

Besides these trading associations, there is also a general organization. Since 1873 the varied and sometimes conflicting interests of the scattered societies have been held together by a central body, the Co-operative Union, based on the Federal principle. The affairs of the Union are administered by a Central Board, sitting in seven sub-committees, answering to the seven sections into which for representative purposes the United Kingdom is divided. From the entire number so elected the United Board is chosen, which meets three times a year, and forms the governing body of the Union. In close connexion with the Union is an immense issue of educational and propagandist literature, and a weekly newspaper, the *Co-operative News*, as the literary organ of the movement.

The supreme authority is the annual Congress, held at Whitsuntide at some great centre, and presided over by some eminent public man. Though known as the Co-operative Parliament, it is not strictly a legislative body. Its function is rather to direct the course of

co-operative policy, to educate co-operative opinion, and to impress the outside world.

Hitherto we have dealt with co-operation within the British Isles. But it has also an international aspect. Five congresses have already been held. That of this year was in London, and will be memorable for taking the first step towards forming an International Union to consolidate the forces of the movement throughout the world. In a few years, therefore, we may expect to see co-operation established on a footing as wide as socialism, as wide as the labour movement itself.

With a force of this magnitude it is clear that Church and State must reckon. Lord Rosebery, in his presidential address, described co-operation as a State within the State. No description could be terser or more accurate. Co-operation acts directly on politics through its Parliamentary committee, and indirectly through its conception of citizenship. Moreover, by embracing so large a portion of the life of its adherents, it compels the attention of the Church. For, undoubtedly, the Church will gain or lose its hold upon the affection of co-operators so far as she shows sympathy with or indifference to their ideal.

What, then, are the claims of co-operation as an economic movement upon the sympathy of the Church?

(1) Co-operation is voluntary, not compulsory. It seeks to uphold individualism, not to eradicate it. Here it holds fast to the instincts of Englishmen and the best traditions of our past. Never once has it sullied its record by an attempt to coerce the unwilling or to attack the rights of property. It invites all, but it impresses none; on the contrary, it desires, if possible, to exercise discrimination in selecting its members, being well aware that its real strength lies not in the number, but in the convictions, of its adherents.

(2) Co-operation makes for honesty in trade. Its professed object is to abolish all false dealing, whether direct, by palming off an inferior article, or indirect, by concealing from the purchaser what he would wish to know. This object it has in its own sphere triumphantly fulfilled. Co-operative goods are always genuine. Moreover, beyond its own sphere, it has exercised a wholesome influence on retail trade. It has lowered prices, extended ready-money transactions, and dealt a blow at that noxious system of credit which injures the shopman, defrauds the honest, and degrades the dishonest purchaser.

(3) Co-operation professes to conciliate the conflicting interests of the capitalist, the worker, and the purchaser, through an equitable division among them of the fund commonly known as profit. Its animating ideal is "fair prices," in other words "equality of exchange."

In the store there is no such thing as profit on price at the consumer's expense. The surplus over cost-price, which, after payment of wages and other charges, goes under the competitive system to a limited number of capitalists in the form of interest, or to the manager as reward for the business of management, under the co-operative system returns to the purchaser in the form of dividend proportionate to his purchase. Since the consumers—in other words, the community—are themselves the capitalists, it is evident that shares cannot rise above par, while interest tends of itself to fall towards the market rate. One signal benefit conferred on the workman is the payment of wages higher than the average, and less fluctuating. The Wholesales

mostly pay at trades-union rates, and are able to tide over periods of depression without discharging their workmen. The co-operative employé enjoys a good position, and knows it. He generally settles his disputes without recourse to strikes.

While on this topic I must not omit a brief reference to the thorny question of profit-sharing. Profit-sharing is being pressed upon co-operators as the panacea for all their failures. The phrase is attractive: it has gained the public ear. Not only philanthropists but many economists and co-operators affirm the inherent right of the producer to a share in the profits of production. Resolutions in favour of profit-sharing have been passed at more than one Congress. Business managers of competitive undertakings have, in several cases, adopted it. It is held to stimulate industry, to content the workman, and to satisfy the claims of justice.

Yet, with some few exceptions, co-operators will have none of it. All attempts to induce the central committees to give it a trial have failed. Productive associations which have tried it have mostly had to give it up. The influence of trades unions is dead against it. To what are we to attribute this divergence between precept and practice? Among many reasons, I submit two which are plain to the non-technical mind. Firstly, because a real partnership between labour and capital must include loss as well as gain; and this the worker will not agree to, his argument being that as he has no part in the act of sale, and no ownership in the machinery on which profit or loss so largely depends, he cannot fairly be held responsible for an unfavourable market. And even if anxiety to profit by a favourable market should induce him to accept such responsibility, the trades union, with its demand for a fixed minimum wage all along the line, at once steps in to forbid him. Hence the business managers of co-operation steer clear of the experiment, and concentrate their efforts on fixing the relative rates of wages and interest on capital, a question they rightly regard as more important.

A second objection to profit-sharing, from the co-operative point of view, is even more far-reaching. The condition of co-operative economics is democratic control. The Rochdale expedient of paying all dividends on purchase, simple as it seems, is the pivot on which the whole success of co-operation turns. When the holders of capital are themselves the consumers of what is produced or distributed, the introduction of a limited body of profit-makers, even though they be manual workers, cuts at the root of the system. In distributive stores the workers are themselves shareholders, and as such they share profits with the rest. It is in productive associations that the real difficulty arises. Some factories have met it by a bonus on wages; but this, just as it is in principle, has not been found to work. Some authorities hold that the Wholesales, by extending their present productive operations, would be able to meet the requirements of the case. However this may be, it seems clear that if co-operation is to remain true to its great principle of democratic control, it will resolutely exclude the antagonistic element of a body of privileged members, and will seek some other method of rewarding successful work. At the same time it must face the undoubted fact that while co-operative distribution has progressed without a break, co-operative production is still in a

struggling condition. It is therefore the duty of all friends of the movement to give the question their earnest thought, and not to rest until it is settled.

(4) There is yet one more object embodied in the programme of the union to which I must briefly advert, *i.e.*, the preventing of the waste of labour caused by unregulated competition in the unnecessary multiplication of shops. No thinking person can fail to recognize the enormous waste of power involved in the presence of five or six distributive agencies where one would do. In London it is calculated that twenty-five shops exist for every twelve that are needed. The same is no doubt true of all our large towns, and to a still greater extent of country districts. Obviously an immense advantage would be secured to the small purchaser by the saving of this waste, and the consequent improvement in goods purchased and reduction of price. Yet he does not seem to see it, but continues to deal at the shop. It is just possible that in towns like Rochdale and Oldham, where co-operation prevails, shopkeeping enterprise may have been injuriously affected; but in the great majority of places this is certainly not the case. And the dread of co-operation instinctively felt by the shopkeeping interest seems hardly warranted by facts. It is indeed surprising that considering the advantages co-operation offers, the poorer classes all over the country do not flock into it. High as the figures are, and great as is the advance of the movement, the annual turnover of co-operative trade does not amount to one two-hundredth part of the estimated business of the country. Even among the labouring classes it is reckoned that for one who deals at the store, twenty deal at the shop.

The Church in confronting this question is bound to be fair to both sides. As Bishop Lightfoot said, she must "Live and let live," and ask co-operators to do the same. She may not disparage or discourage an enterprising and useful body of men in her zeal to secure for the masses a higher economic salvation. At the same time, she ought to emphasize the service that co-operation has rendered to the art of shopkeeping, lifting it from the sphere of petty enterprise into a really great industry, and raising the position of the shop-assistant in his own esteem and in his social force—a service the results of which are by no means yet fully developed, but which must re-act most favourably upon this large and hard-worked class.

May I be allowed without presumption to recommend to any who may desire to promote the formation of a store, or to obtain an insight into the working of this remarkable, and, in the truest sense, democratic movement, the excellent little treatise by Miss Beatrice Potter, and the manual for working-men co-operators by Messrs. Acland and Benjamin Jones. The larger works of Mr. Benjamin Jones and Mr. Holyoake will be consulted with advantage by those who wish for deeper knowledge. For circulating purposes nothing can be better than the pamphlets and tracts published by the central office at Manchester, and supplied, as I can testify, with the greatest courtesy and the most ungrudging liberality.

II.—We come now to the second main aspect of co-operation, which touches the Church and the clergy more directly, what I have spoken of as its moral basis. As the motto of competition is "Each for himself," so the motto of co-operation is "Each for all, and all for each."

On the face of it this is a Christian principle, one which the preacher is bound to inculcate, and the believer to practise. But is it a real motive? Can it be applied in the practical effort to found a village store? Will it stand the wear and tear of business life?

Let us see When a hundred poor persons are invited to subscribe their shillings in order to start a store, the motive we appeal to is self-interest. We tell them that if they will each spend but ten shillings a week at the store, they will, by the automatic action of the dividend on purchase, become capitalists without the need of saving one penny out of their scanty wages, by the simple process of co-operating to secure that part of their earnings which will otherwise go to swell the profits of the shop-keeper or merchant. But since this can only be done by the bond of co-operation, we appeal at the same time to the spirit of association, which counteracts, and, if properly trained, will at last outweigh the selfish instinct. The moral element is there from the first. It exists in the design of the original founder, and it is wrought out unconsciously by the members in the working of his design. If the management be upright, the actual result of the year's operations will bring to pass the motto "Each for all," and demonstrate its truth. It would be unfair to deny the moral character of a movement because it appeals in the first instance to the instinct of self-preservation. Christianity itself does this. The cry, "What must I do to be saved?" comes from the individual soul before the love of holiness for its own sake is formed within it. So in co-operation the desire of greater benefit goes hand in hand from the first with the sense of brotherhood, and is made moral by it. But, of course, everything turns upon the management, and the members' observance of the rules. It may be too much to expect the rank and file to be earnest co-operators; but the directors not only ought to be, but must be, if the store is to do any real good. The seed may be sown in heavy soil, but if well farmed it will yield its harvest. The co-operator has faith in his cause—a faith not blind, but based on reason—certain that what reason affirms must in the end come to pass. It is the moral fervour that lies at the root of this movement which makes it so hopeful for the future. It is the practical bond of brotherhood which gives it its self-reliant strength.

Now it is for the Church to bring out this higher, this spiritual, side of co-operative effort. It is not an illusion; it is truly there, though in the complexities of business and the hurry of work it may be suppressed or forgotten. The Rochdale pioneers were not selfish men. They were all identified with some public cause. The Christian socialists who voiced the movement were not selfish men; they were animated by the single-minded desire to help and to serve. The chief leaders at this moment are not selfish men. They devote all their time and powers to purposes of corporate development for salaries which in no other sphere would be considered a fit remuneration. They work because they know their work is worthy; they count the formation of character a higher thing than prosperity or comfort.

And the Church endorses and approves their work. To go further than this might not at present be easy, for the Church includes those who from their wealth stand outside the movement, and those who

from their interests are opposed to it; and she has her duties to both these. Moreover, co-operators do not seek external alliances. Even trades unionism and co-operation, closely as they are connected, by no means go hand in hand; still less, therefore, could the Church expect to do so. Nevertheless, there is abundant room for individual Churchmen to join the movement, more particularly among the agricultural classes, who are slow to move, and need the guidance of their natural leaders. Though co-operators ask for no patronage or countenance from anyone, they always welcome a comrade who comes as an equal, ready to be included in the good work on hand. I believe many of our leading Churchmen are prepared to do this. The clergy have happily learned that the Church knows no politics; they will learn also that the priest knows no social status. As He whom we serve mingled on equal terms with high and low, making no difference, nor recognizing any, so, too, His minister will strive to free himself from the limitations of birth or training, and grasp in social brotherhood the hand that is extended to him. He need not meddle with matters of economics, or interfere in trade concerns, even as a self-constituted arbiter in disputes. It will be sufficient if his larger culture make itself felt, as it surely will, in the open arena of discussion. Thus, unconsciously to himself, he will prepare the ground for a sympathetic reception of his spiritual message, and a higher value of his ministry. None can doubt that equality is the keynote of modern aspiration. The reality of it in political life has given shape and substance to visions of it in spheres where, perhaps, it can never be more than an illusion, generous and inspiring, but only as an ideal. Let those who hold in Christ's gospel the true key to man's social progress uphold the real equality, and expose the false; let them by word and deed bear witness that he who by his labour serves his brethren is alone worthy of the name of citizen; that he who promotes truth and honesty in production and exchange deserves higher honour than he who rises on the shoulders of his fellows to colossal wealth; that self-help and mutual help can never be severed without treason to the cause of humanity and the Name of Christ; and that every agency which increases mutual dependence and the sense of fellowship is to be vigorously upheld. Let them strive, as co-operators are nobly striving in their special sphere, to substitute the rivalry of good men's praise for the rivalry of ostentatious extravagance; and let them be assured that the Church they serve will be recognized in the future, as it has been in the past, to be the highest and truest exponent of the nation's moral life.

ADDRESSES.

(*a*) Socialism.

The Ven. J. M. Wilson, Vicar of Rochdale; and Archdeacon of Manchester.

I have consented to speak on this subject very unwillingly, from the extreme inadequacy of the time allowed for the discussion, and from the fact that none of the

speakers are representative or working socialists; but I will try to make one or two helpful remarks.

The aim of socialists may be stated as the elimination of all those forms of competition in which the gain of one is the loss of another. The gain of one, they say, should be the gain of all; and the gain of all, the gain of each. Incidentally, but only incidentally, socialism is a protest against excessive inequalities of condition which correspond to no real worth, and are of no real advantage to the community, or to anyone in it. It is, so far, an aspiration after greater social and material equality. It is felt to be a mockery to ask men to be content with legal and political equality in face of a labour problem like that of to-day. That problem consists essentially in the precariousness and dependence of the position of the wage-earner, which are increasing *pari passu* with his intelligence and his worth. From a different point of view, socialism is a protest against that school of economics which concerns itself exclusively with the production of wealth in a country. Socialism insists that equitable distribution of wealth is of no less importance, nor less attainable, when properly understood and generally desired.

Socialism is founded on a sense of the right and duty of a man to earn his own living by work that benefits the community. To the socialist, S. Paul's dictum, "If a man be not willing to work, neither shall he eat," carries the very obvious converse axiom, "If a man be willing to work, then he shall eat." But under the present system, if such a legalized scramble can be called a system, this is not always possible. Men are used to make money with, and then thrown aside like tools. They are, what Aristotle called slaves, ἔμψυχα ὄργανα, animated machines. Socialists are therefore convinced that only by large modifications of our present competitive system, and by the adoption of some form of central control of industry—in other words, by the overthrow, or effective limitation, of the individualistic industrial scramble, and the establishment, or gradual upgrowth, of some form of State collectivism—can it be made possible that all who wish to work can find work and food and housing. Such are, in my judgment, the aims, and such the origin and method, of the socialism that I am acquainted with.

Postponing the consideration of the methods proposed, which we clergy have no special qualifications to discuss, the first thing to note is that the aim so stated is the direct result of Christian teaching, and is in full accordance with it. It is Christ who taught the unity of the body and the doctrine of brotherhood; and few will deny that the state of mind which His teaching creates, when it has been really assimilated, is absolutely inconsistent with acquiescence in a competitive system in which the gain of one is the loss of another. This is the truth which we must look in the face; and I for one acknowledge that it is the socialists who have compelled us to look it in the face, and not evade it by any platitudes. There is in the very theory and essence of our competitive system something definitely un-Christian, and even anti-Christian. If there is to be a unity in our own lives, we must resolve that this contradiction shall be harmonized; and it can only be harmonized by acknowledging the absolute supremacy of the Christian law. In our own personal lives and expenditure, and in the part we take in influencing the action of others, we must "claim for the Christian law the ultimate authority to rule social practice," and that in every department of it.

If anyone dissents from the statement that there is in the very theory and essence of our present competitive system something definitely un-Christian, and even anti-Christian, I can only explain his dissent by the supposition that he cannot have made himself acquainted with the actual facts of life, or ever brought vividly home to himself what Christian teaching is. We suffer from ignorance of facts, and conventionality in ethics. The blinding power of custom is awful. The Turkish barbarities in

Armenia, to take an extreme case, do not, I suppose, seem horrible to the Turks; they are done in the way of business. Yet there are results of our present system, which we acquiesce in every day, and still more remoter results to which we shut our eyes, which may be almost as ghastly and un-Christian in the sight of the angels of God as any cruelties committed by the Turks. And yet society is not awake to the shame of it; conscience utters no reproach. It is done in the way of business.

We need knowledge, and we need the concentration of moral force and sensitive intelligence and resolute hopefulness on these social questions. We are bound to look into the darker side of business, and study the ethics of Christ's teaching in their application to the whole of life, in the belief that His teaching is applicable; in particular, therefore, we are bound, as it seems to me, to give our most careful and intelligent and unprejudiced attention to the methods proposed by those who are calling us to this study—the socialists. There is obviously much to criticize in all practical propositions before us at present. There are defects in their economic analysis. I do not think they give enough consideration to the immense laziness of most men except under some compulsion to work, and the consequent need of some compulsion. There is, I think, inadequate appreciation on the part of certain socialists of the immense difference between voluntary and compulsory sharing of advantages. There is a general tendency to ignore the inefficiency of committees, and the jobbery, and what Walt Whitman calls "the never-ending audacity of elected persons." But, nevertheless, though the world is not ripe for universal socialism, it is ripe for partial experimental socialism, as in State ownership of notoriously unhealthy businesses, and of the retail liquor trade. We are neglecting an opportunity without precedent in the history of nations, if we do not use this time of evolutionary thought and feeling as a preparation of our own and other men's minds for days of change and reconstruction. We are losing a unique opportunity in the history of the Church for offering light and leadership. Here is room for statesmanship.

The Christian Social Union is doing excellent work in this direction; and I hope that one result of this meeting will be the establishment of fresh branches of this union, and the enlistment of fresh students. No one, cleric or lay, employer or employed, who reads the *Economic Review*, the quarterly organ of the Christian Social Union, will fail to find his knowledge increased, his thought stirred, his feelings deepened, his principles cleared, on all that concerns the social problem.

It will give point to what I say if I refer to the Bishop of Durham's wise and noble paper in the April number of this review. I will give, not my own further opinion of it, but that of a working-man, a strong socialist, to whom I lent it. He wrote as follows a few days ago: "One of the most valuable papers on Christianity and socialism I have ever read. Whilst reading it I felt as if I was reading the New Testament, it is so full of the spirit of that book. It carries conviction with it. I am sure there are large numbers of men whose whole lives would be changed if they could only read or hear this paper. . . . A truly Christian paper. I can say no more if I write a column."

We need not look askance at socialists who feel and write like this man. We may learn much from them. We shall also do well to keep ourselves in touch with the movement of thought on socialism in the wage-earning classes, by reading from time to time the publications which emanate from themselves, and which circulate among them. In the *Labour Prophet* (three halfpence a month, Labour Press, Manchester), one comes into contact with that side of the movement which expresses itself in the Labour Church. There is much to make one feel the inadequacy of their presentment of divine truth; but we must be very hard and Pharisaic in our religion if that paper does not stir our sympathies, and make us feel our brotherhood in hope and

aim with the writers, and bring a blush to our faces that our presentation of Christ has been also so inadequate.

One plain duty of us all is, therefore, to study: to study the facts, to study Christian ethics, and to study the application of Christian ethics to the facts. By a concentration of the mind of the Church, lay and cleric alike, on the right and wrong of these questions, and on the mind of Christ, with an ardent and unselfish desire for Christian truth, we may hope to arrive at the needful light, and the rightful temper, in which alone legislation can deal with them. Legislation can only stereotype opinion.

Our other plain duty, with which I must conclude this fragment of a paper, is sympathy. We clergy are the natural links between classes, capable by our position of understanding the feelings and sharing the difficulties of all. True sympathy, however, with wage-earners is difficult. We have not lived with a family on thirty shillings a week, and then found that, without our fault, our employment had stopped, and our skill was useless; but we can do something. We can listen. It is the disregard of their aims and feelings, not the hesitation as to their proposals, that embitters and alienates. Sympathy, not only as to the suffering, which has never been wanting among the clergy, but in the aims, ideals, methods, and proposals, of the wage-earners, is the first condition of usefulness and of influence. If we do not feel with them and with their ideas, they know that we have no message for them, and they infer from us that the Church of Christ offers no leadership to them in their search for righteousness and the kingdom of God.

Finally, I would say to the clergy, that every one of us who faithfully studies and presents Christ to his people is helping to create that temper in which alone the aims of socialists can be attained, whether by the methods they propose, or by others. It is the spirit of Christ in the world that commends the aims of socialism to conscience; and it is the spirit of Christ that will in time make plain their methods. We may be wholly unable to adopt or approve their present methods, but we cannot help advancing their cause in so far as we are faithful to Christ. We cannot help fighting with their foe, arbitrary and irresponsible individualism, and sharing their ardour for social good. To teach the responsibility of Christian individualism is not a bad introduction to the ethics of Christian socialism.

---

(2) Trades Unionism.

The Rev. S. C. Armour, D.D., Headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School; and Hon. Canon of Liverpool.

"What is the proper Attitude of the Church towards Trades Unionism"? As a preliminary question, has Trades Unionism justified its existence? Can it fairly claim, as a system, the sympathy of the Church?

Now, stripping away all accidental questions—the storm and strife through which it has passed, the mistakes and faults which Trades Unionists, like other men, have committed—what is the essential principle of Trades Unionism? It is simply the re-adjustment of a true balance between labour and capital. It is not too much to say that, in these days, this has become a necessity. Modern conditions of trade and industry have not only destroyed the old personal relations between employers and workmen, but they have developed to a wonderful degree the scope and power of capital. New means of production are being continually discovered. New fields of enterprise are being opened up. Not England alone, but the whole world is rapidly

becoming a great hive of commercial or industrial activity, stimulated by intense competition, and governed at every point by the ubiquitous enterprise of capital.

Now it was this relative predominance of capital—especially in the days when labour combinations were forbidden, and capital had labour at its mercy—which gave colour to that monstrous fallacy of Karl Marx so industriously circulated by revolutionary Socialists, that there is a necessary antagonism between capital and labour; that in its very nature capital is the fruits of plunder, the proceeds of a skilful exploitation, in which the workman is cheated by the capitalist out of the "surplus value" of his labour. I earnestly hope that the masterly exposure of this pernicious sophistry by such writers as Professor Flint, Mr. Mallock, and others, will act as a speedy antidote to the poisonous influence of Marx, which has been working in many minds at home and abroad. That labour and capital should be antagonistic is an abnormal condition of things. They are mutually indispensable factors in production, each by itself incomplete. Labour is sustained by capital, supplied with materials, directed to new fields of activity by capital. And, in like manner, capital divorced from labour is powerless, because labour is the instrument which gives effect to its aim and enterprise. So far from their being natural enemies, it would be nearer the truth to regard them, under due conditions, as joint members in a co-operative partnership, in which one of the partners, if he does take most of the profits, takes likewise most of the risk; while the other is freed in advance from the risk by having the share fixed which he is to receive, and likewise the periodical payment of it.

But though this may be a just view of the relation of capital and labour, it is often lost sight of in the strife and struggle of actual trade competition. In the long run, and under rightly adjusted conditions, the interests of capital and labour will coincide. But, in each particular instance, they are opposed. There is jealousy between the partners as to the share each is to take. Hence it is of the highest importance, as a means to reconciliation, that these two correlative factors should be maintained under fairly balanced conditions. Now the balance can only be supplied by the organization of labour as an equipoise to the otherwise overwhelming predominance of capital. This is the principle which, I submit, justifies Trades Unionism as a system. The balance was lost for a time in the mighty transition through which industry passed in the earlier half of this century. The power and scope of capital had been extended and developed to a degree which, in any trade dispute, made a federation of capitalists absolutely irresistible when arrayed against an unorganized mass of so-called "free labour," in the days when the law forbade men to combine for their own protection. The only way of counteracting this predominance was Unionism. Amid the complex forces which govern the labour world, uncombined men are at a terrible disadvantage, as trade history abundantly shows. They have no recognized common interest, no common bond; and, in their blind competition against one another, each undersells the other, and lowers the rate of wages for all. The so-called "free labourer," who is at the mercy of the sweater, has lost his freedom. The name is a grim satire. Trades Unionism has redeemed working-men from this precarious condition of bondage, and restored labour to its proper dignity. The main principle of the movement, then, I submit, is essentially reasonable and just. It has been approved by the wiser and more humane legislation of recent years, and in its justice it has a strong claim on the sympathy of the Church.

Now an ideal to which many are looking forward as the final adjustment of the balance, and the pledge of future industrial peace, is the complete federation respectively of labour and capital. It is remarkable that in the Oxford Conference on the Organization of Industry in 1890 this proposal was warmly approved by representatives of both sides as a sure way to the settlement of differences. For

such federations, the stronger they were, the more certainly would they lead to the universal employment of boards of conciliation, consisting of members who thoroughly understood the position at stake from both points of view, and could weigh the difficulties and demands both of masters and men. We should all be glad to exchange our present state of unrest for such a means of adjudication, when the interests of masters and workmen could be adjusted without recourse to the ruinous methods of strikes and lock-outs.

But, if this happy reign of conciliation is to be fully established, it must rest on the basis of complete organization. And this affords another strong argument for the extension of Trades Unionism. There is little difficulty in this respect on the side of capital. The whole drift of modern trade is towards the greater consolidation and more complete organization of capital. Joint stock companies on a larger scale are taking the place of private firms. Great federations of productive and distributive industry are being formed every day. An even balance, then, demands a corresponding development of Trades Unionism that shall ultimately embrace the whole field of labour. Such organization on either side does not necessarily imply mutual hostility. On the contrary, it is a direct means to amicable adjustment. We might then confidently hope that the clouds of mutual distrust which now prevail would be cleared away.

Very possibly the suggestion of a general labour federation may alarm some minds, and call up the spectre of Collectivism, which indeed was conjured up a year ago in this city of Norwich. But surely subsequent events have shown that the alarm, if ever it existed, may now be dismissed. The ghost has been laid; I doubt if it was ever more than a sheet on a hedge. The gradual organization of labour does not mean that we are going to substitute some socialistic Utopia for our present economic relations. Real working-men are beginning to have had enough of such wild proposals. No, but it means the reconciling of two friends too long estranged. It means putting an end to the folly of strikes, which would be seen in all its naked absurdity when two mighty organizations should stand front to front, and a trial of strength would mean a common destruction.

Still, however we may justify the main principle of Trades Unionism, it must be confessed that in its actual operation there are many things to discourage those who see in this ideal the promise and pledge of social and industrial peace. If the ultimate destiny of Trades Unionism be to unite all branches of industry in one great federation, the task demands the exercise of nobler motives than the selfishness which too often inspires the Trade Union of to-day. The spirit of the whole labour movement is too open to the charge of selfishness. Not only to employers is it manifested, but to other departments of labour, especially towards the masses as yet unorganized. Instead of reaching out a hand to them, many of the more powerful unions display the exclusiveness of a close corporation. No doubt the combination of unskilled labour presents peculiar difficulties. But if ever that submerged residuum, whose existence may at any moment become a danger to the social peace, is to be raised from the bondage of sweating into organized intelligent corporate life, it must be with the help and sympathy and self-sacrificing co-operation of existing unions. The spirit that for once shone out in the great dock strike, when the feeling of all England was roused, when all trades and all classes of society showed their sympathy with suffering men, that spirit must pervade all the ranks of labour if the great consummation is ever to be achieved.

In view, then, of these present conditions and possible future developments, what is the true relation of the Church to Trades Unionism and the labour movement generally? It is a question charged with grave issues both to the Church and the nation. She

cannot regard it with indifference. It is her duty, her great opportunity, to observe closely the movements of our national life, to recognize the social forces which are germane to her own spirit, and potential for the common good. The truth which is her heritage she has in keeping for social as well as individual salvation, and that truth is as direct now as ever it was in its adaptation to the needs and the ills of our social life.

And yet the work of the Church in respect to the labour movement must be subject to a limitation. It is her duty to understand it in all its bearings, to sympathize in the lawful interests and aspirations of working-men, to recognize impartially the rights of labour and its correlative duties. But it is only through her influence on the individual character that the Church can ever effect the regeneration of society as a whole. Her part, therefore, is that of the watchful mother of souls, and not of the partizan in a question of economics. The settlement of a living wage, involving abstruse relations of population and production, is not within her province; but she will fearlessly rebuke the sin of him who wilfully grinds the faces of the poor. It is not her place to direct trade organization, but to enjoin on men the observance of righteousness and peace. She will not make herself a judge and a divider in trade disputes, but she will teach to those at variance the duty of consideration for others, and that there is a place in our economic relations for higher motives than the covetousness which God abhorreth. She will recognize the reasonable aspirations of men to better their worldly condition, but she will remind them that a man's life consists, not in the amount of his possessions, but in the conscious submission of his will to God. This, I think, is the Church's true relation to social movements. In this way will she be true to her mission, neglecting nothing that can minister to the well-being of the whole man—body, soul, and spirit—yet maintaining due proportion between the less and the greater, holding in right subordination things temporal to things eternal, and thus preparing the world for the kingdom of God.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

WE have now only a quarter-of-an-hour before the close of this meeting. I have several names sent up, and among these I must choose. I can only give five minutes to each speaker. I shall, in the first place, call upon the Dean of Hereford, who was so good as to take the chair at the beginning of this meeting, and then I think I shall consult your feelings if I take the two cards sent up, not by clergymen, but by laymen.

The Very Rev. the Hon. J. W. LEIGH, Dean of Hereford.

I AM afraid five minutes is a very limited time in which to dwell upon such a large subject as co-operation. I stand here as a co-operator of thirty years' experience, and if, twenty-five years ago, such utterances had been delivered at a Church Congress as we have heard this afternoon, there would have been quite a scene amongst the audience. But it is twenty-eight years ago that I stood on a platform at the time of the agricultural labourers' strike on the occasion of their first great meeting held at Leamington, and there I advocated co-operation—agricultural co-operation—or co-operation in farming, both productive and distributive, and therefore, perhaps, I may be excused for venturing to make a few remarks. I only regret that this great subject of co-operation was not brought years and years ago before the Church Congress—and that the clergy did not take it up twenty-five years ago—for I believe

that if they had, a great deal of misunderstanding between class and class would have been saved; that we should not have had the number of strikes that we have had; that we should have been a more united and a happier people, and that the clergy would have had a much greater influence amongst their parishioners than I fear they have at the present time. As you know, co-operative farming was started in Ireland, in County Clare, and was carried out by Mr. Scott Vandeleur there with great success. We also know of a very successful productive co-operative farm in the county of Suffolk, which was started by Mr. Gurdon, and I believe that if only there can be a thorough understanding brought about between employers and employed with regard to this subject, a great deal more might be done than has been done with regard to productive and distributive co-operation in villages. I wish, in the very short time that I have, to give an example of what was done in a village of which I was formerly the incumbent. It was remarked by the writer of the paper upon co-operation that, if one hundred poor persons could be got together, and could contribute towards a co-operative store, that it might be shown that, in the course of twenty-five years one who left, I presume, his dividends and his bonuses in, could have £160 there without the trouble of saving. Now, in the year 1867, I was instrumental in starting, I suppose, one of the earliest agricultural co-operative stores in England in a village of about seven hundred people. I was anxious to know whether, after all this time—twenty-eight years—the store was still in existence and still flourishing; and I heard from the incumbent, my successor, to-day, and he tells me that it is very flourishing, and that they had just as many members as they had ten years ago, and that many have saved a great deal. I will only mention this, that with a capital of £350 in this village store, they have a turnover every year of £4,000, and that they have been able to give their shareholders not only their five per cent. interest, but two shillings in the pound every six months as dividend or bonus upon their purchase, and to their non-shareholders one shilling in the pound. They have a small farm, or rather a few fields, where they can have cows for milking purposes and butter-making, and I can only say that it is a most thorough success, and I wish there were other stores like it in villages throughout England.

The Right Hon. the EARL OF STAMFORD.

I WILL assure you at the outset that five minutes is ample time for all that I have to say on this occasion, and I have no complaint whatever to make of that limit of time. My only object was to say a few words to supplement what was so well said by my friend Mr. Cruttwell, who, I think, unwittingly did scant justice to the productive side of the co-operative movement. I have followed very carefully, for the last few years, the work which has been done on that side of the movement; and I have been connected with the Labour Association, which has its office in London, and whose object is to supply a central propagation of the principles of productive co-operation. This Labour Association is not very widely known—not nearly so widely known as it deserves to be—but it includes some very well-known names, such as those of Lord Grey, who has worked actively himself at productive co-operation in agriculture, and the veteran Christian socialists, Judge Hughes and J. M. Ludlow. It has on its list of vice-presidents Tom Mann, and this proves that co-operative production, or "co-partnership," as I prefer to call it, is not viewed antagonistically by Trades Unionism. What impresses me most in the co-operative productive movement is the moral training which it supplies to its workers. Productive co-operation was always in the minds of the first founders of the co-operative movement. The Archdeacon of Manchester will bear testimony to that. The pioneers intended that productive co-operation should occupy as important a place as distributive. Distributive co-operation has gone ahead, and become very successful, and for various reasons productive co-operation has lagged behind; but it is full of life, energy, and hope. I believe that there are at least a hundred and twenty productive societies, in which the principle of labour co-partnership is carried out. Thus the workers have become, or are in process of becoming, proprietors of the concern in which they work. The movement is increasing in the most hopeful manner, and new societies are being constantly added to the list. A central depôt has been established in London, in Southampton Row, where those who wish to secure co-operative-made goods can buy them, and see them on exhibition, and very excellent goods they are. And there is a very lively little monthly periodical, *Labour*

Co-partnership, published at a penny, which represents the interests of this movement. It might be thought from words which have fallen in the course of this meeting, that those who espouse the cause of labour co-partnership or productive co-operation, were inclined to be desponding and hopeless. Nothing of the kind. The movement is making a very favourable and very encouraging start forward, and tends to grow more and more in a very large variety of departments of industry.

H. W. HILL, Esq., Churchwarden of Horsleydown, Southwark.

I VENTURE to say a word or two upon the attitude of the Church towards Socialism. I do not claim to be a representative socialist. I would not venture to do that, nor do I wish to recommend any particular society, nor any particular literature, nor extol any individual as the true prophet in regard to our duty in this very important matter; but I do venture to say a word or two, because for more than ten years I have, feebly, I fear, and in a manner more or less quiet, been endeavouring to draw the attention of my fellow Churchmen to the enormous importance of this great question. As to ourselves, let us do our own social duty, always remembering that our two principal sacraments are the two greatest witnesses of those principles upon which socialism is based. Let us further remember that that man has fully discharged his social duty who has behaved justly and fairly himself, has discharged his duty as a Churchman, and has done what he could in his own particular district in local and municipal work in bringing about a better understanding in regard to the evils existing. With regard to the remedies. Mr. Kaufmann has very truly said that it is our duty to examine all those remedies which are suggested by social democrats for the amelioration of the condition of the mass of people, but I take it that the main object of socialism is the destruction of those monopolies the existence of which in private ownership makes it impossible for the mass of individuals to live a reasonable and a proper life. And therefore in considering this or that remedy which is put before us for our consideration, we have to carefully examine whether its adoption will really in the end help towards the object in view, or whether it may not lead to our last state being worse than the first. For example, take the question mentioned in Mr. Kaufmann's paper of free dinners for starving children in Board schools. Well, the money must come from somewhere; and it is said it must come from the rates. Now I venture to affirm that it is absolutely impossible to get any more funds—certainly not in London—from that particular source, because we must remember this, that while things remain as they are in regard to monopolies, the burden of the rates falls with cruel and peculiar swiftness upon that class only just removed above the pauper class. Further, in reference to monopolies, I have no time to suggest at length what they are, but, first of all, I do not think the greatest monopoly is that of land, and I would cordially recommend the members of this Congress to bear solemnly in mind the warning which Canon Gore uttered on Sunday night as to the peculiar position of private owners of land in relation to Christian ethics. With that light thrown upon this subject, I think all reasonable Churchmen will not be long in making up their minds as to how we are to bring about a better state of society for the individual, by the destruction of monopolies.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

IN drawing this meeting to a conclusion, I think I may congratulate those present on the singularly suggestive papers and speeches which have been delivered to us. The object of the Church Congress is not to formulate conclusions, but to suggest ideas; and in listening, as I have done very attentively, to that which has been laid before us, it seemed to me that there are a few such suggestions which we ought to take away with us for consideration. In the first place, let us define our terms, and try to understand what Socialism means, for I do not know any word which is used with a greater variety and ambiguity of meanings. In the second place, let us remember, if we ask what the Church is to do in regard to this question, that the Church includes the laity as well as the clergy; and on these matters, while we clergy will do our best to bring whatever light we can to bear upon them, you, my

brethren, the laity, have in many respects greater knowledge and greater independence than we; and you are just as much bound to look at things from the point of view of the Gospel of Christ as we who are ordained to its ministry. One thing more, we may well remember—that in all these things the lesson of proper proportion is the lesson of true wisdom. The Church of Christ is bound to have an interest in everything which concerns the social and material welfare of humanity. But her primary duty, on which she must allow nothing to encroach, is her spiritual duty, and she must remember the words of the Master, "These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone." Lastly, while she sympathizes with this movement, she must be true to her own principles of voluntary action and voluntary persuasion, and she must have nothing to do with violence and compulsion, and must not hold that the end justifies the means.

S. ANDREW'S HALL.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY in the Chair.

MISSIONS.

HOME—(1) PAROCHIAL MISSIONS.
(2) UNIVERSITIES AND SCHOOLS' MISSIONS.
(3) BROTHERHOOD OF S. ANDREW AND OTHER CHURCH MISSION AGENCIES.

PAPERS.

(1) PAROCHIAL MISSIONS.

* The Rev. T. I. MADDEN, Vicar of S. Luke's, Liverpool.

I PROMISED the Subjects Committee some months ago to address this Congress on the question of Brotherhoods. At the last moment the committee were compelled to find someone to take the Paper on Parochial Missions. I responded to their appeal, and consented to fill the gap. I regret that the time to *think out* and prepare a paper on so important a subject has been altogether too short. I must, therefore, crave the indulgence of my brethren.

My *first* point will be:—Parochial missions; *their necessity.* We know from the records of the past, and from our own experience, that seasons of spiritual drowsiness often come upon individuals and upon Churches. A moral inertness at times grows parasitically over the Church's energies and cramps her pristine vigour. A torpor seizes the Bride of Christ, and good and evil lie down in compromise. What follows? The lamps of the temple grow dim, "living faith degenerates into dead theologies," conscience is drugged, and the splendid passion for the conversion of sinners, for the uplifting of the fallen, for holiness of life, for self-sacrifice even unto the death, gives place to a succession of mechanical services—beautiful, but not with the beauty of life—attractive, but not with the attraction of the Cross. For such times and for such seasons special men and special means are required to arouse the slumbering Church, else she will sleep a perpetual sleep and not awake.

---

* The writer's name appeared in the Official Programme as a "speaker"; and this paper was set up in the smaller type before the change of programme was announced. —EDITOR.

When we turn to the history of the Hebrew Church, we see how the Lord God sent His messengers to apostate Israel—"rising up betimes and sending; because He had compassion on His people." And the prophets cried aloud: "Awake! awake! O Zion; arise, shake thyself from the dust of the earth, O captive daughter of Jerusalem." The prophets were the divinely appointed mission preachers of the Jewish Church, passing from village to village, from city to city, as the messengers of Jehovah, calling upon men to turn from idols to serve the Living and True God; calling them back, priests and people, to the faith of their fathers.

We turn to the New Testament and to the history of the early Christian Church, and we find that even in the days of the Apostles many of the Churches "slumbered and slept." The fervour and passion of their "first love" was fast vanishing. They had "a name to live and were dead." And because thus early in the Christian Church some began to "fall away from the faith," and to forsake the Church of God, God raised up special men to call His people back to their allegiance to Him.

If I read the history of the Primitive Church aright, I see there an order of "Christian Prophets or Evangelists" altogether distinct and separate from those who ministered the Word and sacraments in the congregation, visiting the Churches, exhorting, rebuking, and saying, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give you light."

As we look back upon fifteen centuries of Church history, many names will occur to us of such "prophets of the Lord," who "at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto our fathers," recalling the slumbering sons of the Church to a purer faith, and to a more spiritual worship. The mission preachers of to-day in our own Church are but the historical successors of Wycliffe and his "Preaching Friars," who did so much to awaken the spiritual life of the Church of England, and to prepare the way for that larger and fuller spiritual liberty obtained for us at the Reformation. We see, therefore, that there is nothing new or alien to the doctrine or discipline of the Church in missions, and certainly they are in accordance with the genius of both the Old and New Testament Scriptures and the polity of the Primitive Church. For these reasons I think parochial missions have been cordially adopted as part of the organization of our Church; and canon missioners, and even cavalry curates, have been appointed by our bishops because they recognized the value and importance of special missions in arousing and giving vigour to the spiritual life of their dioceses.

It is sometimes suggested that missions have had their day; that they are no longer a necessity; that the great revival of spiritual life and activity in the Church of England has made them unnecessary in this last decade of the nineteenth century. Let us be honest. Has the inward and spiritual life of the Church kept pace with her outward religious activities? While we are thanking God that we are rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing, the verdict of the Lord of the Church may be a very different one. We live in a cultured, comfortable, and mammon-worshipping age, and the Church is inevitably tempted to spiritual compromise and to moral slackness. Baptized heathenism of a cultured and refined kind prevails throughout the land, and is often seated in high places. Look, too, at the religious state, or rather the irreligious state, of some of our huge slum parishes. Think of the indifference, the intemperance, the harlotry; think of all the dark devilry as revealed in the daily press and in the police courts, and remember *we* profess to be the Church of the people. What is our duty then? Surely it is to go forth in the strength and power of the Christ, and make our nation in reality what it is in name—Christian England.

II.—Parochial missions; *their methods.* By the word "mission," we now mean a special *method* of working out our great commission, "Go preach," of which method the elements are prayer, and preaching, and personal ministrations, and these are all

familiar to us in our ordinary parish work. It is the combination of these in a sustained and concentrated effort, say for eight or ten or fourteen days, under the leadership of one or more clergymen coming into the parish for that purpose, which constitutes the speciality of a mission. Amongst human incentives to success in missions will surely be recognized the power of a new voice, the cumulative effect of the services, the reiteration night after night of the way of salvation, the personal conversation with the anxious and doubting, and, above all, the earnest and devout prayers of God's faithful people for the mighty working of the Holy Spirit. These methods have been used of God in the quickening and deepening of spiritual life in many parishes in our land.

At first many Churchmen looked upon the parochial mission movement with dread. Missions were denounced as hysterical, emotional, dangerous. Experience has taught us that where wisely conducted--when scriptural and sober—missions are practically free from excitement of a dangerous character. There is an excitement which is of the flesh; there is also a holy earnestness about the salvation of one's soul which constrains men in anguish of spirit to cry out, "What must I do to be saved"?

These old and exploded charges against missions are set forth in the public press by some anonymous scribbler whenever a general mission is held in any large town. Unfortunately there are a few who still believe that "religious mania" must inevitably follow attendance at special mission services; they are, one is glad to think, a diminishing quantity.

There is, however, a large class of Churchmen who object to missions because "they produce a transient excitement, speedily to be followed by a fatal callousness." The best answer to this shallow objection has been given by the late Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Thorold). "If the great bulk of the people are actually fast asleep in sin and worldliness, the only chance of arousing them is by exciting them; if a man's house is on fire, it is not a sufficient reason against ringing his bell or breaking his windows that he may possibly fall asleep again and perish."

The difficulty which most of us encounter is to get men and women aroused to a sense of their eternal danger—to be, in short, sufficiently excited to flee from "the wrath to come." That clergyman was not far wrong who, when asked if he would like "a quiet day" in his parish, responded "Certainly not, what we want is an *earthquake.*"

Slumbering souls—souls dead in trespasses and sin—cannot be awakened without some *noise.* When sluggish souls, dull and cramped minds, and careless hearts, are being stirred and illuminated by the Spirit of Truth, do not think it strange if there should be groans and tears from broken and contrite hearts, "agonizing to enter in at the strait gate." At the same time, let me add, I have seen a mission come into a parish and utterly change its whole spiritual tone, uplifting clergy and workers to a higher spiritual plane, and arousing dead and slumbering souls, and bringing many of the hardened and notorious sinners of the neighbourhood in repentance and faith to the Cross of Christ; and all the while there reigned the calmness and peace and deep quiet of God throughout each day of the mission. The Spirit of God works in "divers manners"—that is the conclusion of the whole matter.

III.—Parochial missions; *their purpose.* We hear a great deal in these days of the indifference and irreligion of the masses, and how to get the masses to Church. A good deal of nonsense is often talked on the subject. Men and women will never be got to Church in the mass, and are not saved in the mass. They are gathered in one by one. A parochial mission which has for its aim crowded congregations rather than individual conversions must end in failure. The mission that does not aim at

arousing the godless, restoring the lapsed, instructing the penitent, and inspiring the whole parish with holy fervour and earnestness for the service of the Lord, falls short of its high and heavenly purpose.

There is a sense, of course, in which every parochial mission reaches the masses. It aims at taking the Church to the people. The steady visiting for months previous to the mission, the daily distribution of tracts and notices during the mission, open-air meetings, workshop services, and special addresses inside and outside the Church, to all sorts and conditions of men, bring the Church into personal contact with the people. They wake up to the fact that the Church does care for their souls, and one by one they begin to come to their parish church to hear what the preacher has to say concerning the things pertaining to eternal life.

The response of the working classes, in the large centres of population, to the earnest and special efforts put forth during a mission, has often astonished their own parish clergy. There are hundreds of parishes to-day where the Church has become a centre of spiritual power amongst the *working-men*—the outcome of parochial missions.

Considerable controversy has arisen on the subject of "preaching" *versus* "teaching missions." A well-known canon at the recent conference of missioners at Keble College declared that "our missions have ceased to make conversion their main object, and so they are not the spiritual power they were twenty years ago." This view was also strongly enforced by a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury. "Looking," his Grace said, "at the phenomena which missions and missioners now present, I am not wholly without anxiety . . . . missioners began with a desire and appetite to convert the wicked, but that has been much resigned, among even the more zealous, for refined paths of spiritual advance for themselves and other clergy; but these have no effect upon the groaning sinful souls who were our first love. Are these reached by the rebound? I doubt it."

This note of warning is well timed. The commission of our Lord to S. Paul is surely the commission to every mission preacher, "I send thee to turn men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Me."

The wise mission preacher, however, will *instruct* as well as *move* his congregation. He knows that the life of conversion and faith rests not upon emotion or sentiment, but upon certain dogmatic truths. Indeed it seems to me impossible to proclaim Christ crucified as the Saviour of sinners without definite dogmatic truths being set forth at the same time. Of course systematic teaching on the Life of the Spirit must chiefly be left to the parish clergy, or a separate mission for the deepening of the spiritual life amongst the communicants might be held some months after the usual mission. However, our duty as missioners is forcibly and clearly stated by the Archbishop; it is the rough work of converting the fallen and degraded, and the restoring of the lapsed to Christ and His church.

Rural Parishes.—Before I pass away from the purpose of missions, let me offer a few suggestions about the evangelization of our country parishes. I fear that we have been so occupied with the great centres of population, that the villages and hamlets of England have been more or less neglected by the bulk of our mission preachers. One who knows the spiritual condition of the country parishes of England has publicly declared that the Church has lost thousands of earnest men and women, because of the spiritual stagnation prevailing in our rural districts. This is indeed a hard saying.

Chancellor Espin urged, some time ago, that "we must not disguise from ourselves the fact that at present our country parishes are our *weak element*."

Thank God there are many country parishes, which, for earnest spiritual work would put to shame many town parishes, but, on the whole, we must sorrowfully acknowledge that the charge of spiritual stagnation in many agricultural parishes is only too true. The causes for this critical condition of our rural parishes are not a few—here is one of them—the *isolation* of the country parson. Think of a man of education and culture placed amongst a handful of people slow of instinct and backward in intelligence. What frequently follows? A kind of paralysis seizes brain and soul; he grows listless, he grows tired of hearing his own voice, he grows lax in his own private devotions. The fire of holy enthusiasm burns low, the earnest desire to fulfil the ministry given of God slowly dies down. Of both parson and people it will in a short time become a true saying, "they all slumbered and slept."

A mission is held in such a parish, and a real *Revival* takes place—giving a spiritual impetus to clergy and parishioners, vitalizing and energizing the ordinary parochial forces—all things have become new.

The vicar becomes a new man to the people, the people possess a new interest for their vicar. As one such said to me recently, "the mission had not only given him a great spiritual uplift, but it had brought him into spiritual touch with his flock, and he had found himself speaking face to face with them in the lanes, in the fields, and in their homes, on subjects connected with their eternal salvation." This was quite a new experience to him.

There is one difficulty connected with missions in rural parishes, viz., the *poverty* that prevails owing to the present agricultural depression. It is not generally known that the Church Parochial Mission Society is prepared to undertake country missions, and to relieve the clergy of all financial responsibility on certain reasonable conditions. I think, however, the evangelization of our rural parishes ought not wholly to be left to societies or itinerating evangelists, but should be taken up by each separate diocese. Indeed, in the diocese of Exeter, and in some few other dioceses, the canon missioners have organized guilds of missioners for the evangelization of country parishes.

If it were possible to get our rural deans to lay aside their excessive modesty and to magnify their office in this direction, our country churches would soon become centres of spiritual life and activity. I am persuaded that the solution of the difficulty lies very much with the rural deans. I know some clergy will not even listen to the counsel of their bishop, much less then that of their rural dean: but I believe every true minister of Christ would welcome the advice and assistance of any brother who could help him in developing and strengthening the spiritual life of his parishioners.

I think I have said enough to prove that as a means of awakening and deepening spiritual life in our Church parochial missions have been owned and used of God the Holy Ghost. There is still much land to be possessed. Woe to the Church of this nation if, in pride of heart—delivered for the time from those who cried "Down with her! down with her to the ground!"—she sits at ease in Zion with arms folded, and says to herself, "I shall be a lady for ever; I shall not sit as a widow, neither shall I know the loss of children," when thousands of her children are perishing—thousands of those baptized within her walls, and having a name to live, are dead in trespasses and sins.

A great opportunity is now given to the Church. Her sons, with an enthusiasm that has thrilled the land, have stood for her *defence*. It is for us, men, brethren and fathers—for us her accredited teachers and leaders by the Spirit of the holy God, given unto us for the office and work of the ministry—to *cleanse* the Church so loyally defended. Let us go forth into the lanes and streets of our cities, into the highways and hedges of our country parishes, and with loving, tender work, win back

the wayward sons and daughters of the Church to a purer faith, a holier life, a more devoted service for God and humanity. This we ought to do—this we pledge ourselves to do—God being our helper.

---

(1) Parochial Missions.

The Rev. John Rashdall Eyre, Vicar of Sheffield; and Hon. Canon of Liverpool.

It is held, I believe, universally by those qualified by experience to judge, that the true success of a parochial mission depends upon the fulfilment of three conditions: it must be diligently prepared for beforehand, it must be thoroughly worked at the time, and, more than all, it must be carefully followed up afterwards. A so-called failure may generally be traced to the non-fulfilment of one of these three conditions. Where they are observed we may look with confidence, under God, for real and permanent spiritual results. I am permitted to lay before the Congress an illustration of this in a mission held a few years ago in a large parish, consisting almost entirely of artisans, at S. Helens, Lancashire, of which I was vicar at the time.

I.—While the organized preparation for the mission was of the usual kind, a noteworthy feature of it was the preparation of the Church itself. (1) Pew owning in it had been recently declared to be illegal, but the decision had not been acted upon; and (2) the whole internal arrangements of the building needed reconstruction and renovation. The opportunity was seized of making it convenient and attractive to working people. 1,800 seats were provided, in which every single worshipper could sit, stand, kneel, and see the pulpit with perfect comfort. All the seats were fitted alike, and were open to the first comer; and 1,200 Bibles, 1,200 Prayer-books, and 1,200 hymn-books, all alike, and of a large and good print, were regarded as an indispensable part of the restoration of the Church, and were placed amongst the items of its original cost. Thus the large expense was in a sense easily met. We ascribed the notable results of the mission that followed largely to this preliminary re-arrangement of the church.

II.—Two features of the mission itself have stamped themselves on my memory, which I may perhaps mention in passing.

(1) One illustrates its value in bringing out men-workers. I led a band of them myself into the street where the lowest people lived, stopped them under the lamp-post at each corner for one verse of a hymn, and made each speak to the crowd for three minutes in turn. It "broke the ice" for them, so to speak. Some of my boldest and best workers began their service of the Master under that lamp-post, and there tasted for the first time the sweetness of bearing His Cross.

(2) The other shows that obedience to the Lord's command, "*compel* them to come in"—obedience not in the spirit, but in the letter—is not only possible, but actually practicable, amongst colliers and men of that type. I well remember, for instance, at the close of a mission service, seeing an enormous collier, evidently deeply impressed, but trying to get away, and my little curate endeavouring to detain him in the church. I was irresistibly reminded of a tug and an East Indiaman; only in this

case the Indiaman was clearly tugging the tug. Happily *I* was disengaged and available just then. I came to the rescue, and brought the man safely into port—in other words, I put him into a pew, and placed the curate at the door, so that there could be no escape. The result of the mission to that collier I forbear to mention now; it is too sacred to tell here, and his history is only one out of many. But the working of the mission itself, rich as it was in most blessed spiritual fruits, needs not to be enlarged upon here, for it was for the most part of the usual character.

III.—But two results of that mission, and its direct outcome, were, perhaps, in their extensive and permanent character almost, if not quite, unique.

(1) The first was the Bible-classes for men and for women. Ninety men and seventy women had been gathered in by the missioner at meetings for men and for women respectively. What was to be done with them? Were they to be allowed to disperse? "No! by the Lord's help, no!" was the reply of the vicar and of the vicar's wife; and, wholly without experience of such work, and in fear and trembling, they undertook the effort to keep the men together, and the women together, by means of a class for each on Sunday afternoon. In a short time the seventy women had become four hundred, and the ninety men had become a class of over seven hundred; and under the able and sympathetic superintendence of my successor, that men's class consists, after seven years' existence, of only twenty short of one thousand *bonâ fide* members.

The spiritual tone of the mission was maintained throughout. The single attraction was the hymn-singing and the address. The large area of the re-arranged church, with its 1,200 Bibles and hymn-books, served admirably as the classroom, gave reverence to all the proceedings, and, it may be added, secured a silence valued alike by teachers and hearers; for in all ordinary Bible-classes are they not the chatterers and questioners who are least worth hearing, while the most thoughtful and godly will never speak? The subject was "The Men of the Bible:" a few verses were read, and three or four telling phrases in them were repeated, thrust home with pithy, pointed application, and fastened in with homely, vivid illustration and anecdote, with the happy result, under the Divine blessing, that the thoughtful and educated clerk was interested, and yet the collier who could not read, and who had been hiding himself away yonder in the far corner of the big church, holding a Bible upside down, it may be, and yet not noticed or found out, has been known over and over again to repeat the whole lesson in its entirety to his wife when he got home. My successor is now taking with the men the Thirty-nine Articles, circulating beforehand a printed syllabus of the next Sunday's address, which is studied by the greater part of them with the utmost interest. The spiritual tone of the mission was maintained in the constitution of the committee. There is danger, if the class chooses them, that the socially influential rather than the spiritually minded will be elected. My plan was to make every man a committee-man—I cared not how many—if he would take a district, visit sick and absentees, and join in aggressive evangelistic work from time to time, by which now and again I trained and tested them. Thus the committee was the very cream of the class.

(2) The second abiding result of the mission—and largely through the Bible-class—was the congregation in church. Three out of five were men. All had Prayer-books paged alike. How they followed a sermon on a bit of the Liturgy, book in hand, the words, phrases, and connection explained, with reference to the pages given! How they sang the Psalms, chanted slowly in a ding-dong fashion on purpose to suit them! In the Psalms and responses the men were as loud as the women; in a three-time hymn the women were nowhere—fairly drowned! Every Bible was open through the lessons. Over and over again the reader at the lectern has been startled, thinking birds were flying in church. No; 1,200 pages were turning over at once. So with the text; and if the preacher gave a reference in his sermon, he must wait till they have found it. Yes, and on a weekday evening I have often seen three hundred working folk sitting there, Bible in hand, following a Bible study. As to the offertories, suffice it to say that I often fairly staggered into the vestry beneath the weight of the great alms-dish, with its edges bent up and threatening to break clean off.

Here, then, is one instance at least of a mission well prepared for, well worked, and well followed up, rich with solid, permanent results.

And here is an evidence, too—if, indeed, evidence be needed—that working folk *can* be won to love the old Church of England, *can* be taught to understand and appreciate her Liturgy, *can* be trained to take their part in, and thoroughly to enjoy, her matchless services.

A class and congregation of working folk such as this is, I venture to submit, after all, *the* best and strongest bulwark of Church defence.

The Rev. A. F. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, Head of the Oxford House, and Rector of Bethnal Green.

I THINK I shall best discharge the duty entrusted to me to-day of bringing the subject of Universities' Missions before the Congress, not by attempting to give a list of the Universities and Public Schools' Missions, either at home or abroad—most of which you will find correctly catalogued in the "Church of England Year-book"—but by trying, in the time at my disposal, to reveal what I may call the "inwardness" of a University Mission. I say "try to," because it is one of those things not easy to do. I was once walking with a casual acquaintance down the side of a rushing stream in Switzerland—it was sparkling in the sunlight, and changing colour every moment. I remarked what a difficult thing it would be to paint. "Oh, no," he said, "I will show you exactly how it's done."

I have no such confidence, ladies and gentlemen, that I can paint for you the extraordinary charm of a University Mission. If you saw, only for one evening, the superabundant life, the flowing energy, the organized rush of a Universities' Mission; if you heard the babble and the clatter of the bands and the boys' clubs, the strains of the violin mingling through the wall with the voice of an orator at the debating society; the clang of the rifles of the cadet corps, answering back the click of the billiard-balls in the men's club; and if underneath the whole you were quick enough to perceive *the one steady purpose of it all*—to spread life

and happiness and Christianity in the district—you would see something which would remind you of nothing so much as a rushing stream, and yet you would fully understand my difficulty in reproducing it.

I.—But perhaps the first thing to mark about a University Mission is that, like mercy, *it blesses him that gives as well as him that takes.* If you were able to watch, as it is my privilege to watch day by day, the work of the thirty young laymen and more, who, under my unworthy guidance, form the University Mission known as the Oxford House, the first thing you would notice would be that as they gave, day by day, "themselves, their souls, their bodies," as a reasonable service for the good of their fellow-men, and the advancement of God's kingdom, by a subtle but inevitable law, you would see that they were receiving something at the same time. What are they receiving?

(*a*) First, an expansion of *heart*, *mind*, *and soul.* After all, how cramping in heart, and mind, and soul too often is a university education by itself! Trained by our very system of prizes and scholarships to be competing for something from our earliest years, exhorted by our parents and guardians to "get on" whatever we do, shut out by our "narrowing nunnery walks" from the cry of the world's needs, the only wonder is that more of us do not grow up into insufferable prigs, and that the ordinary 'Varsity man is not a great deal more selfish than he is.

So, again, with our *souls.* We were told to "save our souls" from our earliest years, and regard for our spiritual state was impressed upon our often heedless ears; but that we could only "save our souls" by giving them away, only win our lives by losing them, that faith in Christianity and a religious education was a gift given us in trust, to be passed on to others, and that you cannot possibly save your own soul unless you have made some genuine effort to save your brother's—this, I venture to say, was a fact often unrevealed to us in our 'Varsity days.

And so, again, with the *mind.* Academic discussions in an armchair about the relative weight of arguments for and against the existence of God; the likelihood or non-likelihood of the Incarnation—these were, perhaps, the subject of our discussions—as if we could possibly know whether the Incarnation was likely or not until we had seen the need of it, or know what the Gospel was until we had seen it in action!

This, then, is the first thing that a University Mission does to those engaged in it; it is like coming out of a little sheltered bay into the great ocean; it is like a ship finding out what a ship is made for, as she feels at last the winds over her and the waters beneath her; the heart expands to embrace the world's needs; the soul's life gains reality as it first feels the shock of the world's sin, and the mind loses its narrow measures and petty standards, and sees in the gospel of Jesus Christ the only adequate answer to the world's sorrow.

(*b*) But more than that. What can anyone do in the world of men, either as a statesman, a philanthropist, or a clergyman, without a *knowledge of human nature?* and how can a knowledge of human nature be possibly acquired except by contact with men and women?

It is this priceless knowledge—to be acquired by no books, and to be reached by no short cut—that University Missions give, and it is as useful for the future statesman as for the future parson. Three of those working at or in connection with our own house became Members of Parliament at the last election, and they will have ill-learnt their lesson from

the men and women of Bethnal Green if they cannot throw themselves, in consequence of their work with us, with greater zest, and, better still, with more accurate knowledge, into the problems which the statesmen of the future will have to solve.

(*c*) So, once again, from this point of view, what a training it is in *resource* and "*savoir faire.*"

"Why, how long have you turned religious?" said a young woman on the doorstep genially the other day to one of the last residents at the Oxford House. "Please, mother, here's the sanitary inspector," greets another; while anyone who knows anything of the working of men's and boys' clubs knows the incessant demand which these make upon temper, tact, and resolution.

II.—But it is time to turn to the reverse side of the picture. *What effect do Universities' Missions have*—not upon the men who work them, but—*upon the men among whom they work?* And remember I am speaking of a University Mission which consists, as it ought, principally of laymen, and which is a mission in the sense of being a distinctly Christian undertaking.

(*a*) First, it convinces a poor district, often for the first time, that "*the classes*" *care for them.*

We, who have friends among the better classes, who belong to those classes ourselves, scarcely realize how little obvious it is to the poor, say, in South or East London, that the better-off care for them at all. They are left to themselves in large, crowded districts; many kind-hearted individuals go one by one and carry on their work of love, but in such enormous districts they are lost in the crowd. There are, of course, the parish clergy; but it is considered that care for the poor is their professional business. "It's their living to visit us," as a woman said the other day. What, then, is needed to convince the poor that "the classes" do care is a sustained, organized effort, known to be a labour of love, carried on from year to year in their midst; and such a labour of love is a University Mission.

(*b*) It convinces the men *that laymen believe in Christianity.* Some of these laymen may have little to do themselves with the directly religious work. A good University Mission ought to have such a wide sphere of activity that men of all sorts may find work of all sorts to suit them, and, as at the Oxford House, a man should be able to come there and look after the drains of the neighbourhood and superintend the relief, and have nothing to do with taking the Bible-classes or teaching in the schools, if he prefers not to do so.

But, on the other hand, it is perfectly well-known in the district that the men have a chapel in the house, or at any rate have prayers every day and go to church on Sunday, and they are perfectly well aware that a man does not leave a beautiful house in the country and slave through June, July, and August at the Children's Country Holiday Fund without some motive; and though one here and there may say, half jokingly, "Mr. Ingram, oh! 'e must make a pretty penny out of that Oxford 'Ouse!" regarding it as a flourishing boarding-school, yet the great majority are cute enough to know the facts of the case.

(*c*) So again, and perhaps this is the strongest effect, from the point of view of Christianity, that a University Mission has in the district—*it prevents Christianity being despised.*

It is the contempt for Christianity which is the most trying thing to face in a working-class population; the identification of the churchgoer often with the cadger, the persistent belief that no one goes even to a mothers' meeting except for what she can get; the sad fact that it is by no means always in a workshop the best, or the manliest, or the most straightforward who call themselves Christians—all this hangs a dead weight of contempt, though not unmixed with awe, round the name of professing Christianity. Now this a University Mission, if strong enough, largely dispels. It is sure to be able to hold its own physically in the district, and if it can also hold its own intellectually, it will find that the older men will respect those who can beat them in an argument, as the younger men respect those who can beat them in a game.

(3) *What*, then, lastly, *can a University Mission do for the clergy?* It can do the very thing they most need. We are always hearing of how the clergy have to "serve tables," to spend in collecting the coppers in their boys' club, or in superintending the accounts of the sick fund, the time which they should be spending on their spiritual duties. Now, all these things a University Mission ought to do, and, in fact, does. The members of it can either manage parochial clubs, or themselves carry on clubs in parishes so as to make parish clubs unnecessary; they can bear the burden of sending the children into the country; they can investigate cases of distress; they can carry on a sanitary aid committee to look after the housing of the poor; they can teach in the Sunday schools; and, if strong enough to do so, without dropping any of their outside work, can take on a new parish, make their head its rector, and work up a congregation into an empty church.

I have no time to draw out in detail how much more a University Mission can do. You will observe that I have taken the word mission to mean that the subject was to be treated rather from a Mission point of view. I have left out, therefore, all the municipal work, the School Board work, the social work that can be done. I have left out the way in which it becomes a focus of work for those who cannot live there, and the most effective of all nurseries for workers in the future. But what I would ask is this: Is there any reason why the blessings of these missions, which we have seen do really bless both him that gives and him that takes, should not be extended throughout England? And the answer is a double one—in one sense, Yes! and in one sense, No!

(*a*) *In one sense, Yes!* There is a limit to the number of those engaged in professional work who have time to live and work at a University Mission; there is a limit to the number of men who can afford to live even for a year there; there is a limit to the resources of a University in carrying on a mission it has started. After a meeting held in London some months ago, I was asked next day by two bishops and an archdeacon to start three University settlements in three distinct parts of England. *There is a limit to the possibility of doing that.*

(*b*) *But in one sense, No!* There must be thousands of old Public School and University men throughout the country who only want organizing and inspiring to start a University Mission in the place where they live.

Take this fact alone. I go round the colleges at Oxford every year, and have an average of forty men in each college at the college meeting out of each college, to produce thirty residents in the Oxford

House, about one and a half men are required. What happens to the thirty-eight and a half? Say that another one and a half go to Toynbee Hall, and another two to their Public School Missions, that still leaves you thirty-five to be accounted for. *Where are they?* I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, not only to answer that question, but to find them—they must be all round you, up and down the country. I ask you, who are old 'Varsity and Public Schoolmen here, to take the lead. Have a meeting before the winter begins, take an empty house in your neighbourhood as a rallying point, fix on a definite bit of work, and do it. I ask you, my brothers of the clergy, to give the laymen a freer hand than you often do, and let them do some work which is especially theirs in the district, and you will find, if I mistake not, that you have had close to your hand all the time an unexploited treasure; you will find the veil of indifference or reserve a thin veil, which will melt before unpatronizing encouragement and honest work; the pent-up forces of love and sympathy, restrained for want of use, will be liberated at last, and you will have freed a power which will move the world.

---

(2) Universities' and Schools' Missions.

The Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton, Hon. Chaplain to the Queen, Vicar of Eccles, and Rural Dean.

I feel considerable difficulty in dealing with the subject of School and College Missions, inasmuch as it so happens that I have never been able to take any direct share in the work of these very remarkable organizations. Nor is it easy for anyone to speak with much authority on their methods and probable lines of development. They are curiously various in their character and systems of working, and they have scarcely been in existence long enough to make it possible, and certainly not to make it advisable, to criticise their methods, or to compare them with each other. All that I can pretend to do is to call attention to the principles which seem to underlie these missions, the objects which they aim at, and the success which so far they have attained.

It should be remembered, to begin with, how very recent the whole development is. There is, I believe, only one School or College Mission which was in existence twenty years ago. Though Rugby instituted a fund to support a missionary teacher in India more than forty years ago, and Haileybury followed its example in 1873, yet the credit of starting the modern system of School Missions must be given to Wellington College, whose Mission in South London has this year attained its majority. All the rest, from the great University organizations of Oxford House and Toynbee Hall, down to the humblest annual contribution of a small school to some definite parochial institution, are still, speaking legally, in their infancy. But some of them are very surprising infants. I need not specify particular cases, for it would be invidious to compare when there are such great differences in wealth and opportunity, and my object rather is to bring out the general characteristics of the whole system. But let anyone look through the pages of the "Church Year Book," which are devoted to Universities and Public School Missions, nd he will be amazed at the evidence therein of life and progress and

vigour, and at the magnitude of the work already accomplished. And nearly all this has arisen in less than twenty years.

We are not here, however, to spend our time in wonder and eulogy, but to try to understand what all this means, and what we can expect it to accomplish. I do not know whether I shall carry all the friends of School and College Missions with me when I say that their final cause is *not* to raise money for various parochial organizations, or to tax the children of the rich for the benefit of the poor. I do not deny that something would have been gained were this the only object in view: a very considerable sum of money has been raised since these missions began. But we must recognize that it can never be anything very great. The richest school in England contributes, from present members, about ten shillings a head annually. No one who recollects his own impecunious school days will underrate this, looked at from the boys' point of view; but when we remember that schools and colleges range in numbers from nine hundred down to one hundred and fifty, it is clear that the financial support given by each to its mission cannot be very great. And what is given might probably be raised, without much more trouble, in other ways. The final cause of School and College Missions, the great benefit they are conferring upon the Church and the nation, is that they bring the spiritual and social needs of the people into our educational system. They provide object lessons in thoughtful and Christian philanthropy. How great the need of this is must be clear to all who realize the danger of the separation of classes, and the difficulty, after the stress of practical life has begun, of learning how to know and how to help those who need our knowledge and our help. From my own School and University experience I should say that this was the element most conspicuously lacking in the education of a quarter of a century ago. We learnt many things, but we learnt nothing about poverty and its problems. The boys and youths who now spend Bank Holidays in the school playing-fields, or in college courts, entertained and entertaining, were to us "cads" or "louts," and nothing more. There was little or nothing in our training to eradicate the ignorant selfishness which is the natural tendency of most men, especially perhaps of most Englishmen. All this has been changed. The masses, with their needs and their dangers, and the special lessons they have to teach us, have entered into the lives and thoughts of thousands of boys and youths who formerly would have known nothing of them; and that is the great work of School and College Missions.

Therefore, when we are tempted to underrate the actual results of these missions, and to assert that more could have been accomplished, with less expenditure of time and trouble by other methods, the objection, even if well founded, is irrelevant. I do not indeed admit that it is altogether well founded. The work done by these missions in the various poor districts in which they have been planted is in one way exceptional. It has been very largely carried on by young men, who have been attracted to it because of its connexion with their school or college. Everyone who knows anything of parish or mission work knows how invaluable the help and enthusiasm of the young is, and how difficult it is to obtain it. There are certain things which cannot be undertaken, certain classes who cannot be reached, without it. A great deal that has been most characteristic and most valuable in the work of

School and College Missions would have been impossible had the old method been followed, and new parishes formed with the usual parochial organization, and without that contact with young life which has supplied the missions with vigorous and unconventional workers. But this, though important, is secondary. The good results of these missions must be looked for, not chiefly in the districts where their work lies, but in the schools and colleges which have established and are maintaining them; and by those results they must be tested. The missions spring from great educational institutions, and their true object is educational.

Regarded from this point of view, we find something to criticise in the methods and results of the missions in general. From all sides one hears the complaint that it is difficult to keep up the interest of the boys in their School Mission, and I believe much the same would be said of undergraduates and their College Mission. Now it is clear, in the first place, that a great deal depends on the missioner. If he is a man with the gift of attracting and inspiring the young, his periodical visits and reports to the school will have a magical effect in making the boys realize and sympathize with the work that they are helping to support. But such men are rare, and it cannot be expected that there shall be one for each of the missions. And without such gifts, the missioner may be a most admirable man for his work, and yet fail to keep up that vital contact with the school or college which is essential for the main purpose of the mission. We do not need parishes supported by the pounds of masters and dons, and by the unwilling shillings of indifferent boys and undergraduates; but we want boys and young men to take a living interest in the lives of the poor, and in the best methods of work among them. It seems to me that in many, indeed most cases, the mistake has been made of putting the mission too far from its base of operations. If the missioner cannot make his work vivid and real to the boys, they ought to be able to go and see it for themselves. But this can seldom be done, simply because of the distance.

There is a great and often disregarded force in the old word "neighbour." Sympathy can hardly be created artificially, but it springs naturally from the influences of neighbourhood; and help that is given to our neighbours because of their natural relation to us is more helpful and more genuine than that which is given to objects which have to be sought out at a distance. The first duty of a School or a University is to the people of its own neighbourhood, and the most thoroughly successful missions will, I believe, always be those which have acted on this principle. Even when it is impossible to find a suitable district for mission work in the immediate neighbourhood, there are few schools which are not fairly near some great town to which boys could be taken from time to time to see the work for themselves. I do not mean that schoolboys, or even undergraduates, should be utilized for regular parochial work; boys, at all events, are scarcely suited for this. But besides an occasional concert or entertainment given by the school in the mission, small parties of the elder boys might be allowed to spend a Sunday at the mission house. This is done in at least one of the most successful School Missions, and I do not know that, in others, there are any insuperable difficulties except that of distance. Again, the summer camp has been used as a means of bringing the

school into contact with the lads of the mission district, and the results show that this method also might be extended with advantage. It may be said that all this must take up time which schoolboys ought to be devoting to their work. Well, in most English schools there is such a thing as leisure time, some portion of which might well go towards the objects I have mentioned; and even if there were not, I would meet the objection fairly, and affirm that to take interest and to join in the work of the College Mission is a highly important part of a boy's education, and time must be found for it. I do not know whether it will fit him for any profession, but it will fit him for the primary duties of a Christian citizen.

Turning to the actual work carried on by the missions, it is clear, from the considerations I have already mentioned, that it must depend for any help beyond that of the normal staff upon former members of the school or college. This is perhaps the most successful and valuable part of what these missions have done. Those whom Canon Scott Holland, in a well remembered speech on behalf of the Oxford House, spoke of with great commiseration as the hapless unemployed of the West End, have been enlisted in religious and social work in East and South London, not to speak of their own neighbours in Kensington and Notting Hill. In several cases this development of the system is no longer left to chance, but a London committee has been formed to concentrate and organize the help given by "old boys" to the mission. Where this has been done, I believe that, besides the actual work done, the financial results have been excellent. In one conspicuous case, and probably in more than one, the sum raised annually by the London committee exceeds the contribution of the school, and enables the mission to carry on work which, but for it, would be quite impossible. And when one finds from the report that this movement took its rise at a dinner given at the Bachelors' Club, and that the secretary is a Hussar officer, one realizes that it has, so to speak, tapped fresh sources of supply for the social work of the Church, with consequences which may be very far-reaching. The committee, I am told, "is a very great source of strength to the mission," and it may be suggested that similar organizations should be started wherever the mission district lies at a distance from the school or college.

I have spoken more of School than of College Missions, partly because the work of the Universities in London has the best possible representative to speak for it at this Congress, and partly because what has been said about schools applies, with some modifications, to colleges also. There is, however, one practical suggestion I would make, not for the first time. Oxford has, to a very great extent, concentrated her efforts; only two colleges at Oxford have special missions of their own. Cambridge, on the other hand, has developed several College Missions, with no central University organization. Both systems have their advantages, but it is clear that at Cambridge the colleges which are not able to support missions of their own are shut out from any share in the work, except in so far as Cambridge men accept the opportunities afforded them by Oxford House. Some years ago an effort was made to combine the colleges which have no mission of their own, and to form something like a Cambridge House. The effort came to nothing at the time; but I cannot but think the idea is worth consideration. It is a great

pity that any of the rich streams of youthful enthusiasm which might be fertilizing barren regions of society should be running to waste for want of a little co-operation and organization, and I venture to make this suggestion in the hope that some Cambridge ear may catch it.

In conclusion, I would say that scarcely any recent movement gives such hope for the Church and the nation as this. It has its difficulties and its drawbacks, of course; the definite results may be necessarily limited, perhaps more limited than might have been anticipated; but as a witness to the changed attitude of classes towards each other, and as a means of bringing them still more closely together, it will, I believe, stand out as one of the great facts of our generation when our history comes to be written.

---

(3) Brotherhood of S. Andrew and Church Mission Agencies.

Arthur Giles, Esq., F.R.S.G.S., Edinburgh.

Last autumn, in the genial sunlight of bracing October days, many were the wearers of a red cross in the beautiful city of Washington. With its stately marble Capitol—symbol of national government—and its Monument, telling in towering simplicity a Churchman's life with a single purpose to serve God and his country; no American city could have furnished a framework more in accord with the feelings of an order of Churchmen sure in their foundations and with lofty principles, seeking the spiritual and regarding the practical. The occasion was the Convention of the Brotherhood of S. Andrew, an order not bound by vows renouncing the secularities of life, but, of set purpose, a voluntary society of men living in the world under a rule of daily prayer and a rule of weekly service, bishops and clergy being their counsellors and colleagues. They numbered thirteen hundred delegates from thirty-seven states, including four Indians and six of the coloured race, men of every profession and of all ages—youthful enthusiasm linked with ripened experience; white, black, and red men all mingled in proof of the blending power of Christian brotherhood under service; nine hundred kneeling together at one altar in the grey of a Friday morning. They were met to confer regarding lay obligations, sixteen bishops being with them.

To estimate aright the power that permeated so many hearts I had crossed the Atlantic. I stood before the assembly representing Churchmen in Britain; I looked into earnest faces, I got down into hearts, and sat in council with those whose souls were strung with what we call the brotherhood idea. Four Canadian delegates sat beside me, and were there to contribute of their zeal. I was there the better to understand the idea—that of a spiritual crusade of young manhood and a great-souled interest in others—manifested in a daily concern for our brother, and a definite effort in his behalf, by personal influence and the constant intercourse of soul with soul. And now I will tell you of the society as operated by our daughter Church of America, but I cannot speak of it without regarding it as a world-wide order, bound by and interlaced with two rules, in the logical application of which the Brotherhood of

S. Andrew has been the only means by which the earnestness and enthusiasm of young men have been called out in the Church of the United States.

The rule of prayer is to pray daily for the spread of Christ's Kingdom among young men, and for God's blessing upon the labours of the brotherhood. It is a brother's faith based on the first and great commandment, in his love to God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind. The rule of service is to make an earnest effort each week to bring at least one young man within hearing of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as set forth in the services of the Church and Young Men's Bible Classes, and is a brother's practice based on the second great commandment, which is like unto the first—"thou shall love thy neighbour as thyself." By the time limit, both rules are quickened into living warmth and force. Prayer is cast with the beams of the rising sun o'er the daily round, to secure in service one effort amid the week's varied occupations and relations. In a sphere exhausted of heaven's ordained and essential element the brotherhood could not live; to part with its distinctiveness and definiteness it would lose in the earth the arrows meant for higher flight.

For years the Church everywhere has sought to hold the men, and various methods have been tried, with greater or less success, which the brotherhood desires to sustain, utilize, and energize, by generating a spiritual potentiality to drive their wheel-work. What the American Church has seen, and that in the Colonies is observing, is, that to get at men the Church must use the young men to move among them, that it must deliver unto these a message, clothe them with a holy consciousness that they have a work to perform, and send them forth as messengers of Christ to deal with men in prayer and with tact. Going forth in this consciousness, and realizing their lay priesthood, thousands in the brotherhood are now seeking in one way or another to influence those about them, and in many ways drawing to church irregular church-goers, or those who don't go at all. This they are doing as their central and supreme effort and as specialists in man to man work, regarding the Church, in all its relations, as the embodiment of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. It is by individual relation and personal effort that the brotherhood operates. Its exemplar is the saint who, having in his enthusiasm found whom he sought, straightway, in another and unselfish ardour, went to bring his brother.

In the Rule of Service the S. Andrew's man seeks whom he wants, whom when he finds he leads Christward, Heavenward, Churchward. The Rule is real, it is not ridiculous. It prescribes no obligation to find, but emphasizes one to seek. There may be many paths, numerous turnings, and varied efforts ere a member accomplish his purpose. His talents may not be those of another. His object may not lie in the direction of another. Varied, therefore, are the phases of chapter work, and different each member's application of effort; and while it may be the member's function to find what to do, and how to do it, very much may lie in already organized institutions, or in others devised by the chapter or the order. Not until the brotherhood was originated was the development of effort realized. The discovery of legitimate paths has gone on apace. Little efforts have grown and become known far beyond their field of inspiration.

I would particularly have you realize the large interest which is not present in mere parochial organizations, and which has been a factor in building up the order, by bringing home to the young layman large conceptions of Church life and activity, and leading him to comprehend the practical value of the Holy Catholic Church.

I have indicated the central effort of the brotherhood to bring men to church. While some are busy around drawing friends and acquaintances in the direction of the House of God, special are the plans in aisle and pew for caring for strangers and welcoming young men. Bringing the unbaptized to Baptism, others to Confirmation and Holy Communion, which five hundred chapters particularize, is another effort. Six hundred emphasize bringing some to Church Services and Bible Classes. Of four hundred Bible Classes, the clergy conduct one hundred and sixty-two; laymen two hundred and thirty-eight; and ladies eight. At boarding-houses and on the streets attractive cards of welcome to services and classes are distributed in hundreds of parishes; while visiting young men in their homes is the work of most, and certainly of four hundred, chapters. About two hundred chapters carry on missions, and three hundred engage in visitation of hotels to direct men to, or induce them to go to church. Sick and poor, those in hospitals and prisons, are extensively visited. Fifty chapters manage rescue missions. Seven hundred brotherhood men are lay readers, and one hundred and eighty-four are preparing for Holy Orders. Special men's services, men's clubs, and work among sailors have largely occupied the attention of many, as have also meetings for various purposes. The training of boys for the brotherhood have been a speciality of one hundred and sixty chapters. But, I may say that the methods of work are multifarious, nothing being done without the knowledge of the rector. Lay co-operation, not lay rivalry or lay interference, is essential to a chapter's usefulness and continuance. Bazaars, concerts, and other entertainments, and likewise financial schemes, are excluded from the brotherhood idea. Members who engage in such do so as individuals apart from brotherhood obligations.

In spirit, the brotherhood of S. Andrew must be and is a free and open organization, setting forth that the Church is for the people. It enjoins courtesy to strangers, markedly to young men. It believes that numbers are to-day outside the Church because of the manner of many who are within it. For those that no ordinary service can reach or attract it has done much. Under due licence, lay readers have gone about with their chapter members to outlying or to populous districts, and held services, simple but sufficient to touch hearts and awake consciences: and why should the embers of Churchmanship or the tiny sparks of religion not be drawn together, guarded and kept aglow, wherever possible, until sustenance arrive, instead of ordaining them to die in their coldness, darkness, and neglect. Churches and mission stations have been the result of new ground thus broken. Similar efforts have also drawn many to regular Church ordinances, for there are numbers who will only respond to unconventional services, who yet afterwards are induced to tread regular paths. The coldness and rigidity which characterize too many of our present congregations do not give a salutary first impression. It is the province of the brotherhood to introduce and supply a felt warmth into every aisle, and a heartiness of

worship into every pew, and to miss no opportunity of bridging the way to the church porch. Nor have home missions satisfied the young Americans; their branch has now a missionary in Japan and another in China, and the Church has formally declared the brotherhood one of its missionary auxiliaries. (To Japan the Scottish brotherhood has twice contributed.)

You will understand that a society pledged to seek must take care not to lose. A chapter's home responsibility therefore lies to a degree in not letting a single man leave home without commendation mailed to where he is going, and by his own hand delivered to a church or chapter when he reaches his destination. I speak of men and chapters. Personal enthusiasm and fraternity naturally dictate co-operation. Thus those pledged to brotherhood rules in the same parish, mission, or educational institution, are banded together in chapter. To create such only earnest men are desired, men of purpose, who will bring to the work energy, tact, and sanctified common sense. Two, with the rector, are sufficient, and at most they should be few. The brotherhood handbook explains how organization is effected. Work is the purpose, and bye-laws must be simple. Members are pledged at the altar rails, and must be admitted to a chapter. Every chapter must in turn have a charter, which the written consent of the priest in charge can only obtain. His continued approval is essential, and if withdrawn the charter is recalled. Loyalty to the Church is thus assured. Boys' chapters are all under brotherhood men, and the same principles apply.

As individuals contribute to the efficiency of a chapter, chapters in local union unitedly accomplish much that they cannot alone. Local assemblies conterminous with districts thus give opportunities for wider concerted action, conferences, and special services.

I hope it is plain to everyone that the brotherhood is a society of a new sort and range, every member of which is under obligation to exercise his lay priesthood, with a degree of self-sacrifice, in the definite direction of his vow. It is an effort to awake the zeal of the laity, much of whose work, to quote from Bishop Westcott, has in the past been added by the clergy to their own, to their mutual and grievous loss. It is more. The embodiment of the ministry of laymen, indeed, a fellowship after S. Francis d'Assissi, who never received the priesthood, is in it presented to men. "Societies by the hundred," said the *Boston Herald*, in reviewing the Brotherhood Boston Convention, "have been born, sickened, and died. A few of the fittest have survived, and the basis of living fitness lies in those which are founded for what they can do, not for what they can get. Combining 'for what we can do' has made efficient workers in the brotherhood." The elimination of the social element and all local secularities disposes of any apparent conflict with the large class of institutions whose purview is the parish, and whose aim is to attract by subsidiary expedients the largest possible numbers. The earlier development of recognized systems of parochial or local organizations has also given rise to an idea of it utterly opposed to what it really is, and hasty admissions and failure of probationary chapters may have been the result. It is not another guild for mutual improvement, even of a spiritual kind, nor a field for missionary effort; it really is a spiritualized mission to all men, incapable, if it obeys the law of its nature, of developing gravitating tentacles, but evolving from

its aspiring inbeing, wings for upward and extended flight. "The Church of England," said the Bishop of North Dakota at the Connecticut Church Club, "is to-day pervaded with a spirit of work, and the Americans would do well to imitate some of the things it does so well; but," he added, "we have presented to it something better and nobler than all, and that is the Brotherhood of S. Andrew, a grand institution, and fast becoming a great power in our Church."

To be a similar power in England there must of necessity be the true conception of it by the Church herself—her influential laity must by their personal identification with its real and earnest work, make its name honoured, its ways respected, and its work effective, as throughout America. In so doing they will commend the Church, commend religion, and commend themselves. It must, in the first place, include the young earnest laity of the upper and middle classes, and present through them to men an intelligent understanding that it is, as said at the last Church Congress, their right, their duty, and their privilege, to take an active and definite part in extending the Kingdom of Christ. The Bishop of Durham says we cannot rest till every Churchman is a Church worker. Nothing, says the presiding bishop of the American Church, respecting the brotherhood, would do more towards making well-grounded and well-instructed Churchmen, ready to take their place in the councils of the Church. In order of importance the Bishop of New York classes, after Synod and missionary society, the Brotherhood of S. Andrew third of ecclesiastical bodies, and calls the brotherhood convention, "that which represents the active sympathy of the Church." The Archbishop of Ontario notes its beginning in the Mother Church, and with the Bishop of Quebec, whose old parish in England had church after church surrounded with all kinds of agencies, believes thoroughly that the brotherhood is needed here across the water. The Primate of Australia says it has in large measure proved itself to be an organization of helpers supplying a necessary want; while the Archbishop of Canterbury is much impressed with all he has heard and read of the brotherhood, as have also been many of our bishops. Let me plead for it in the Church of England. It has Episcopal commendations many;—American, Canadian, and Australian —and Provincial and Diocesan Synodal resolutions of approval. The brotherhood, then, is neither a parish guild nor like to any already existing organization, whose merits lie in numerical success. It is a bond of the few for the many, in which quality outranks quantity. It works to get men into the Church, not into the brotherhood. The Bishop of Quebec, under lay help, mentions "the S. Andrew's brotherhood, men whose small chapters are like a live coal imparting vital warmth right through a clergyman's work." It utilizes as fields of work all institutions calculated to influence men churchwards, such as, may be, the Church's Young Men's Societies, Men's Help, and Working Men's Church Societies; Boys' chapters acting on junior institutions. The purpose for which it exists calls for some sacrifice and requires some self-consecration, which admits of no duality of basis, no associates, honoraries, or ornamentals. The leaders are men of ripened experience, business capacity, religious fervour, and unselfish life, and the rank and file are forward in all parochial activities and local charities. In political and commercial life an astounding abundance of youthful lay energy is displayed, and the

Church claims a rightful portion of enthusiasts, so that in the ingredients of the world's freshest life there may be a fair amount of salt that has its savour to preserve noble souls for the world to come. But let me inquire whether amid the ever-increasing syndicates and societies that bind and energize to-day's world, the Christian Church really has, after all, according to its necessities, sufficient and suitable lay equipments for every emergency. If in the battle new and varied forces have entered the field on Satan's side, counterforces as varied must be brought to meet them on the Church's side. Invulnerableness on our side must cope with its appearance on the opposite. For the enemies' matured projectiles of deadly effect there must be others of telling power for us, and Christian strategy must surpass that of the power of darkness.

The Brotherhood is above party, and the same spirit pervades its whole. Its stand for unity lets its love surge over into the world's very wickedness, in co-operation where it may with all who love the same Jesus. In heaven's atmosphere of prayer it pleads for union, and shows it forth in its service. "To the Anglican Church on both sides of the Atlantic," wrote an eminent divine, to the brotherhood here, "belongs much that in these troublous days shall make for the peace of Christendom, and to the brotherhood in this relation there was a glorious future." It may be that a large admixture of the lay element is wanted in the fusing medium. And there is a yet higher aspect of the order in the brotherhood of man. It sees in the "Our Father" the one Father and divine giver of all to all, and prays for the "our bread," as for all. The prayer that impels the S. Andrew's disciple brings the accumulated S. Andrew's force face to face where it righteously may with class and mass, by endeavouring to solve with the Church's aid the ensurance of their temporal welfare as the concomitant of a duty to ensure their eternal. The Church, which created societies of all kinds, has stepped further out of her spiritual domain into the cold of wretchedness and darkness of despair. She calls around her workers to help her educate, feed, and clothe, as well as bind up the broken-hearted. They who follow S. Andrew are fitting themselves to be high stewards in the temporal as well as in the spiritual feeding of the multitude.

We have treasured advantages in a settled and leisured country, and our satisfaction with things as they are may lend over confidence as regards their completeness. Under the shadow of Lambeth we discern times for action; within it is a library of wisdom; but not necessarily in the centre of the Anglican Communion may originate every institution of the Church's mission. The marching orders are to go into all the world, a world of latitudinal and longitudinal unlikeness, varied conformation and condition, in which an elasticity of method has to be learnt. Adverse forces arise and are first seen where circumstances favour them, and it is there where the necessity for meeting them may be first understood and resistance and repulse prove successful. The first brotherhood members at S. James', Chicago, had no idea of a Society. They saw what was then plainer to them than has even yet become sufficiently plain to us, that young men were forsaking the Church in greater and greater numbers by absence from its services, detachment from all its relations, and withdrawal from all its influences. They felt that the leakage must be stopped. They saw where it could best be

seen, that young men were leaving their homes and walking straight into danger, a prey to every evil. Church and Sunday were sinking out of sight in the disavowal of religious belief by an alarming percentage of the people, and the practical disregard of them by masses of the remainder. They saw they must offer to strangers and wanderers fraternal hands, give service freely and cheerfully, seeking no return, and dedicate themselves and all their opportunities at the altar. Simplicity of bond, directness of aim, and individual action were to be outstanding characteristics of whatever they could do. By observation they knew that the few, not the many, did the work, and that many energies were directed by young men. In three years they increased the men at church from a handful to three hundred. Their example was copied; the success of simplicity spread. It passed from West to East, went South and North, crossed the boundaries of states, territories and oceans, to be known in Britain, and to appear at the Antipodes. It has touched India, Germany, Japan, and Brazil, and now numbers about twenty thousand men. A current in the altruism of Christianity, the order is an altruistic force of individuals, strengthened in the chapter, and finding therein a power within and a purpose around. We endow institutions that they may continue after us to do their work when we rest from our labours, and the continuity of power and purpose instilled into youth is a compound endowment. The future is ours in the kernel of the present. If we would direct the leaders and leaveners of the world after us, let us look to the young men. The world's life and history is growing and budding among them; its fruition is much in our hands, and for the neglect of our life's opportunities God will not hold us guiltless.

DISCUSSION.

HENRY CLARK, Esq., Brotherhood of S. Andrew.

THE Brotherhood of S. Andrew means the enlisting, one by one, of laymen, into the great Church army. The Brotherhood of S. Andrew is a voice of the Church, a voice of the clergy, and a voice of the laity. It is a voice to the clergy reminding them that they have material at their feet which is waiting to be utilized, which is lying dormant now, and only requires to be brought out and utilized. It is a voice of the laity, asking them to come forward and do their share of God's work in the world, and this means enlisting one by one into the organization of the brotherhood. Now this brotherhood has accomplished a marvellous work, as you have heard, in America. The amount of enthusiasm which it generates in America in the lay mind, and in the clerical mind, is something past comprehension and past description. I say, the enthusiasm it excites is such, on the part of every American brother who comes over to England to see Mr. Giles, that one of the first questions he asks is: "Have you any chapters in this neighbourhood that I can visit, so that I can see what you are doing in England with respect to the brotherhood?" This work, I say, excites enthusiasm. Why is this? For two reasons: First of all they are great Christian helps, and these great Christian helps are in the Bible class, in giving encouragement to attend Church service, the Holy Communion, and coupled with all this there is the realization of the fact that the brotherhood is working, not for an idea, but for a Person, and that Person is the King of the Kingdom that the brotherhood has brought into existence—the Spirit—the King of the Kingdom that we ought to remember every day, that His Kingdom may come. Now I will put a case to show you how the brotherhood could operate to advantage in England, and operate in very weak places. The brotherhood has either half a dozen or ten what may be called warm men or outsiders, who are

inquirers—men who come to learn, and who are brought in in the hope that they may learn the brotherhood idea. The clergyman finds that he is able to fill his school, but his church is empty. I am not going to deal with the reasons, but I am going to show you how the brotherhood can help the clergyman to maintain his flock, which he has been for so many years endeavouring to feed and nourish, and to prevent him from being a shepherd who has lost his sheep. At confirmation, for instance, the clergyman can come to the chapter and say there are twenty boys who have to be looked after, and he can say: "I now ask half a dozen of you men to influence a dozen or twenty boys. Here are the names. I authorize you to be kind to them. I go to the boys and tell them that you are going to be their friends and help to look after them." The result will be that a great many of these boys will become in some way or other to be attached to a chapter, and will learn at the fortnightly meetings what religion is, what Church teaching is, and what the practical duties of life are. A meeting of the chapter means—and there are very few people who know anything about it—that a director is nominated by the clergyman, who is his mouthpiece, and, therefore, there can be no schism. There is no such thing as dispute. The clergyman gives an address of twenty minutes or half an hour, while the other half-hour is occupied in brotherhood work—in considering how this man or that man can be got into the brotherhood, and in that way become members of the brotherhood.

The Rev. J. H. LESTER, Rector of Lexden, Colchester; Prebendary of Lichfield; Warden of the Church Parochial Mission Society.

I AM glad to see the completeness of the ground covered by this subject as it is arranged, and especially the prominence given to the folding of the ingathered members of the flock of Christ. In reference to this, I desire to call attention to an organization at home, which, while it contains the salient point of the Brotherhood of S. Andrew which commends it to our notice, is capable of much wider application, and consequently, greater completeness in its work—I mean the Men's Help Society. These two organizations are alike in the formation of a band of laymen whose special work is to bring others from among their fellows into the fellowship of the Church. Nothing can be more true to Christian principle, and nothing better calculated to help the clergy in their work among men; for it is the formation of a real link between the incumbent and the generality of men in the parish. In aim and object, the highest grade of the Men's Help Society is the same as the Brotherhood of S. Andrew—the workers must be communicants; they must daily seek to spread the Kingdom of God. In fact, the American Brotherhood of S. Andrew is contained in the English Men's Help Society as its highest order, and there is a rule that where the Brotherhood exists, the Men's Help Society will adopt it as its highest order. But if that order stand alone, as it does in the Brotherhood, and in an ordinary Church guild for a special purpose, there is a serious disadvantage. The necessity of one standard, and that a high one, is exclusive as well as inclusive in its operation, and has a deterrent effect upon men outside. They feel it is too high for them, and they are driven further away, and become the class most difficult to reach, and most in need of a sustaining and uplifting sense of fellowship in their struggles with temptation and sin. Now all this is provided for in the Men's Help Society, with its four grades or orders of workers, guardian members, members and associates. Each man joins the order which is suitable to his particular capacity and need, and the progressive rules of life, belonging to the different grades, constitute the successive "standards"—to use an educational phrase—of his spiritual advancement. This is the true principle; we see it in the training of the disciples in the New Testament, and we recognize it in all education. If you adopt the Brotherhood of S. Andrew, you will need to supplement it by other organizations. The Men's Help Society will do it all. If you have a number of guilds, each for its separate purpose, that society can equally well come in and give them organic cohesion; it can simplify their working by having one set of officers, one set of books, and one set of meetings, it can strengthen them all by the increase of power which comes of unity of life and action. This is becoming more and more a matter of experience among the clergy. It is a significant fact, that in America in little more than a twelvemonth the Men's Help Society has been organized in no less than twenty-two dioceses.

The Rev. E. C. HOPPER, Rector of Starston, Harleston.

MAY I call attention just for one minute or two to the excellent work which is being done at the present moment by our College Missions in South London. With all due respect to Mr. Ingram, I may say that my own college, S. John's College, Cambridge, was the first to start a mission of this kind in South London. They could have gone anywhere they liked; but after taking a good deal of evidence, they were asked to go to South London, which required assistance more than the East of London. There are several other missions all about that part of Walworth at the present time. They are not all working in the same way. Ours started parochial work, and we have now a parish of seven or eight thousand people. We have a church, parish room, and all the machinery for parish work. One great advantage of these missions is that they can be put down wherever there is a plague spot, or place which requires them more than any other. I can give you a similar instance from Oxford. The Rev. Osborne Jay had for some time a parish without a church in Shoreditch, and it is difficult to see what he could have done had not Magdalen College, Oxford, come to his rescue and adopted his work as their college mission. It was supposed at one time that our colleges were going to be secular, and there was going to be no religion in connection with them at all; but within the last few years our colleges have started a spiritual work which they had never done before; namely, these College Missions, which have done very good service to the country. I am rector of a small country parish in Norfolk, and I find my people in Starston take a considerable interest in this home mission work.

The Rev. ARTHUR PHILLIMORE, Rector of Enville, Stourbridge, one of the Assistant Diocesan Missioners of Lichfield.

THE previous Speakers have spoken about "Our Work;" I should like just to add a few words about "Our Wants" in the Church's Home Mission Agency, especially with regard to parochial missions. First of all, I think the Church's immediate want is a canon missioner in every diocese in England and Wales. The advantage of such a provision is obvious. It is true some dioceses already have such; but it would be a grand thing now if some of the faithful laity would come forward with part of the wealth with which God has blessed them, and help to found in those dioceses which are still without such, a mission canonry. Of course, a canon missioner is able to give up his whole time and life to the work. He has no parochial duties and no parochial anxieties to follow him wherever he goes. We all know that if we leave our parish for a while something is sure to happen. Moreover, a canon missioner has time to arrange for the prolonging of a parochial mission if need be; and it is very important that a mission should be able to be prolonged, if necessary, beyond the original period determined upon. A third point is that a canon missioner has time for study. Why, I ask, should not a missioner need time for study as well as any parish clergyman? He has intellectual difficulties to deal with in many cases, and study and prayer are both essentials for his work. Then, there should also be a diocesan fund which could assist the poorer parishes in meeting the expense of their missions. I dare say many an incumbent has hesitated before asking for a mission, because of the necessary expense in carrying it through. I think such a diocesan fund would remove that real difficulty. Another point is, that we must all bear in mind the original purpose of the parochial mission. We want, in fact, fixity of purpose with variation of method. For the purpose of a mission is not so much to edify the faithful, as to "turn and soften the wicked, to arouse the careless, to recover the fallen and restore the penitent," through the power and mercy of God. We may be quite sure, that under God's blessing, the faithful will not lose by it. They, too, will get their message. But we have to remember, first and foremost, the great fact of the presence of evil. While we set great store by the teaching missions, we parish preachers and missioners must yet remember that the original purpose of the parochial mission is to evangelize. May I mention another need? We want more parishes to open their doors, and to ask for the services of a missioner. The missioners cannot get into some parishes; and I wonder, therefore, whether all the clergy are giving to their people every chance they can. It is quite true there is no good in going to any parish if the work began by the mission is not going to be carried on. But I hope that some of the clergy will think over the matter and give it their prayers and thoughts, and then confer with the diocesan, and ask him to send down his canon missioner or one of his assistant missioners for the benefit of the parishioners. And lastly, we want more laymen in the Home Mission field. Mr. Ingram has spoken about

attracting the laymen from the upper classes, and I do not doubt but that some will come forward in response. But we want others as well, who will offer themselves in loyalty to the Church, and in submission to due authority, for lives of self-devotion and earnest effort in the great harvest-field of the souls of men. Had time permitted, I should have liked to have spoken of the well-organized effort in this direction in Lichfield Diocese, known as the "Lay Evangelists' Brotherhood."

ASSEMBLY ROOM.

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. THE BISHOP OF THETFORD in the Chair.

MISSIONS.

FOREIGN—(1) TO JEWS.
(2) TO JAPANESE.
(3) TO CHINESE.

PAPER.

The Right Rev. G. F. POPHAM BLYTH, D.D., Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem and the East.

THERE is scarcely a question of the day more vital to the future of the Church than the recognition of the claims of the Jews upon Christianity. I am going to plead this cause with you as being most intimately associated with the prospect of my bishopric, which is one of representation of the spiritual and also of the missionary influence of the Anglican communion at the Mother City of Christendom, where the hope of the Jews centres. As your representative in the Holy City I may advance a claim upon your attention which is due to a specialist upon a subject of common interest.

But first let me clear away, if I may do so, some difficulties of prejudice, for prejudice has a fatal power to hinder a great cause. Prejudice flings a misconception in one's face, and expects that it shall be as final as if it were sound argument. And, first, it is a misconception to suppose that the subject of Jewish Missions is not of Catholic interest, but is the enterprise of a party in the Church. It is not so. Party principles fluctuate, and develop new characteristics; but the claim of the Jews is universal and perpetual, and is upon the Church herself. Again, it is a prejudice to allege Cardinal Newman's stricture as counter to the episcopal representation of the Anglican Church at Jerusalem. Few who do so are prepared to admit that that great mind was right in leaving the Church of his baptism, or that he would have taken that step had he now to decide on the position of the Anglican Church. May he not also have been hasty in what he said of the Jerusalem Bishopric? It is as real a prejudice to argue against the present Catholic position of the bishopric—I touch upon this point as most important in its connection with Jewish work—as it would be to discredit the usefulness of some renovated parish church of to-day, with all its agencies and prospects for good, because in 1841 it was only up to the standard of that day of tall pews and infrequent services.

It is a prejudice to talk of the past connection of Prussia with the bishopric—a connection never abused by Prussia—as a reason against supporting the reconstituted bishopric of to-day. Had one of the

main hopes of those who, in 1841, projected that through this bishopric episcopal orders might be given to the Lutheran Church been realized, who can say what might not have been the influence in 1895 upon the cause of reunion, and upon Jewish interests, of strong Church principle in Germany, accredited by the power of Apostolic orders? And, last, it is prejudice unworthy of an English Churchman, which makes him less intelligent than Churchmen of the East of the legitimate position and prospective influence of the Anglican Church at the Mother City of Christianity. Here episcopal representatives of all other Churches in Christ are at home, as were their Apostolic founders, without invasion of the rights of S. James of Jerusalem. The Eastern Churches have always felt that the representation of the Anglican Church in the Holy City might be a helpful influence in the revival of spiritual and of missionary life, and of Church reunion. The aggressions of proselytism have greatly discredited this influence, both with reference to my own efforts and that of the Archbishop's Assyrian Mission. But the want of the faithful prayers of English Churchmen, withheld through prejudice, has told more heavily than all else against the right direction of work and influence legitimately open to us in the East.

Away with all prejudices from the path of progress. It is foreign to my purpose to-day to show how very disastrous these are to the great cause of Church reunion. But it is exactly to the point to declare their fatal action, through misconception of the legitimate policy of the bishopric, against the revival of that national Church of unique promise which is the great prospect of the Holy Land, and even of Christianity, the Church which was the first to be planted, where the Blood of the Saviour, and of His first martyr, still pleads for mercy, and which has a Scriptural future—the Church of the Hebrews.

It has been a strange and baneful disobedience on the part of the Church of Christ which has for so many centuries denied to the Church of the Hebrews the place and primacy which Christ assigned to her in His Kingdom upon earth. Christ gave commission for the evangelization of the Jews after their rejection of Him, on the eve of His Ascension, and in the hour when He instituted the Holy Sacrament of our Baptism. The missionary commission is therefore as universally binding as is that to baptize; and Jewish missions are as obligatory as are those to the Gentiles. This order was invariably obeyed by the Apostles. It is barred by no Canon of any General Council. Christ, Who foretold the desolation of the Holy City and of the Land of Promise, foresaw the *local suspension* of the order "beginning at Jerusalem" until the return of the Jews to the Holy Land. But who gave permission to the Church to disobey Christ by neglecting to preach the Gospel after the Apostolic example to those sad exiles, in the cities of their dispersion; and to substitute for that obedience a most un-Christian and general persecution throughout centuries of the Christian era? Where is the warrant for that? It was prejudice that prompted that disobedience and fired that persecution. And who can say what gloom of the "dark ages" of the Church, and what deadness of spiritual life and influence, have not reacted from that prejudice? Who shall decide what schisms, what disunion in the Church, what baseless assumptions in the West over the primacy of the Eastern cradle of Christianity, are not the natural consequences of the refusal of the

Church to recognize the relative position given by Christ to the Jews in the brotherhood of the Gospel? Who can estimate the loss to the Christian commonwealth through the injustice of the Church to those on whom rests the commission of the Apostle of the circumcision, "when *thou* art converted strengthen thy brethren" in the Faith, and whose restoration to the Church, as her missioners, was to be to her "as life from the dead"?

There has been a universal disobedience to one integral side of Christ's missionary commission, which concerns the Jews, "of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, Who is over all, God blessed for evermore," and Whose ordinance of missionary blessing is perpetual. The Jew of to-day reads the New Testament so generally that it is a marked feature of his present religious study. The Jewess—who reads therein the will of Christ with regard to the social and spiritual position of women, and Christ's prohibition of those iniquitous "bills of divorcement," which still are the curse of Judaism—does so even more anxiously and more hopefully. But who can measure the effect of centuries of oppression in prejudicing the veiled heart of Judaism against Christianity? Who can say what a shock to the mind of both Jew and Jewess, what a riveting of other prejudices, is the discovery of the disobedience of the Church to the missionary commission of Christ concerning them? Christ may well be, through their study of His own word, a better Advocate than any missionary may hope to be, of the claims of Christianity upon the Jews. But until the missionary allows for the fact that the Jew is only justified in giving up his own heaven-ordained type for the full glory of a faith which has not destroyed but fulfilled Judaism; until he presents less the importance of individual conversion than of that which individualism hides, the incorporation of the convert into the Household of God's Church—which has the eternal priesthood of Christ, the sacraments of His institution, the ritual of His temple, and the glory of His services—we shall seldom win the Jew from his old types to the great reality of Christ's religion, and we shall not lead him to seek and to obtain the mercy of Christ, until we show to him the mercy which we have received through his fall, in place of the intolerance of these many centuries of his reprobation.

What, then, is the present attitude of our own Church towards this side of our missionary duty? Our liturgy—revised in days prior to the revival of missionary spirit—has one collect for the Jews, in which they are annually presented to heaven in the forefront of those outcast: "Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics." This, surely, is not an adequate presentment of the commission "beginning at Jerusalem," and addressed "to the Jew first." But we have had, of late years, throughout our communion a "day of intercession for missions." And what does the word "missions" present to the average mind? Africa, China, Japan, and the Islands of the Sea—not the Jew. The office for that day does not plead for him as one integral side of Christ's missionary charge. The well-known missionary hymns of the Church do not give him his due prominence. Convocation might assert his claim, but it has not yet done so.

But how startling are the facts of the day. The newspapers bristle with the movements of the Jewish people. What they now are, commercially to the world's industries, financially to the world's progress,

towards social questions and to those of peace and war, everyone knows and feels. How long will their rights in Christ be ignored? If the order to "begin" missionary work at Jerusalem was suspended only by the fact that the Jews were no longer there to begin amongst, how about the state of the Holy Land to-day? When the century opened we might scarcely count their hundreds. In 1841 they were 8,000. In 1887—I am connecting their rise in numbers with the eras of this bishopric, as their future must greatly concern it—they were 60,000. Now they are about 125,000, or three times as many as returned from the captivity in Babylon. The land is also ceasing to sit desolate, it can support a larger population than it now holds. The restoration with efficient regularity of the "latter rains," for so many centuries withheld, gives back its historic fertility, wherever the hand of the cultivator is upon his plough and his sickle, upon his vineyard and his fig trees. God's Providence must be concerned in bringing back the exiled race, and we note that His eye is again upon the land for good, in its necessary preparation for its inhabitants. And then, whilst everywhere there is on the surface the old prejudice against the Gentiles, and the old avowal of refusal of Christ, there is a real and significant change from the bitterness of Jewish infidelity. Christ or atheism is alternative before the Jew. The revival of a religion of types and sacrifices is impossible—I do not say against the spirit of this century, but against a simpler and purer dispensation from God, which has fulfilled them all. But admit, as due to the indifference of atheism amongst educated Jews, much present toleration of our faith, which once they opposed; give again to education, give to friendliness to a Church and nation which recognize their claim in the brotherhood of man, due weight and influence, and still there remains a change of front towards Christianity which cannot be explained away, and which is a vast encouragement to missionary effort. There is an avowal of disapproval of the Crucifixion of Christ. There is an admission of His claim to be a Prophet, to be the Messiah, at least, of the Gentiles, to be the holiest of the sons of men. The assertion of the Yemenite Jew, "Our fathers never returned from the Captivity until now, we are not chargeable with the black deed of the rulers against Jesus," is but the expression of a wide-spread desire to reverse the imprecation of eighteen centuries past; it seems like a prayer, "May His Blood be forgiven to us and to our children."

The dawn of revival in the Church of the Hebrews, first to be planted and now in suspension under promise of restoration, is an era of unique responsibility to the Church. Feeling the intimate connection which our bishopric in the Holy City must necessarily have with the revival of that Church; holding the watchman's post as I do at the Mother City of Christianity, and calling the Anglican Communion as I may to this crusade of the nineteenth century, I must not forget that the opportunity which is in the charge of our Church to-day, with all the facilities which we have for touching the heart of the Jew, is not ours primarily and solely. We hold it now with the full sympathy and assent of the Church of the land, which may not at present essay it. The day will soon come when that ancient Oriental Church will revive to take its proper interest and share in the evangelization of the sons of Abraham—children of Israel, Ishmael, and Esau. The declaration of the Archbishop of Canterbury is perfectly

true and real, that the revival of the Churches of the East is not a matter of sentiment, but of necessity. "Simply because they must be the missionaries of the future. . . . We ought to be doing our best to train up Orientals as the great missionaries of the East. It is Oriental people who will bring back Christianity to the East." Long experience of the East, and insight into the position of English and other missions in Eastern lands, convince me that this is the right view of our duty to Christ. Ruin entered the East through the degradation of the Churches; it may be retrieved through their restoration.

There is a real and full harmony—however it may jar upon those who are unfortunately committed to other views—between the two great aspects of the policy of my bishopric: faithful representation of the Anglican Church amongst the Sister Churches in Christ at the Mother City of Christianity, and faithful representation also—to which they assent—of that missionary energy which characterizes her witness in the world; which indeed is the very life of the Church of Christ, of her every branch, of her every baptized member.

But there are elements of decadence in any party presentation of the Church to the Jews. The evangelization of the Jews is, as I have said, a great Church question. There is a significant incompleteness in any isolation of such work within any bishopric where there is a Jewish population. Wherever the Jews are—in England, in America, in Palestine—there must be the Church of Christ before them in her full reality. That only will attract their allegiance. The bishop, in every diocese where they sojourn, must gather them to his oversight. They leave a typical Church with its Divine ordinances, they must be incorporated into the living Church of God, not into an association. They must not be individualized by any unattached and abstract presentation of Christianity. In the East especially, where the fact of our representation of Anglican missionary spirit in the presence of Sister Churches lays us under obligations of order and unity, all agencies for their conversion must act in loyal concert with the bishop. They are, I repeat, one integral side of the commission of Christ to His Church, and the revival of the Church of the Hebrews is a Church mission.

And very immediate action in this great question lies with the clergy. The spring of the vast developments of Church life of the day synchronizes significantly with the revival of obedience to even one side of Christ's missionary commission—that to the Gentiles. Let the clergy challenge heaven's treasury by essaying the other. They are responsible for bringing it before the people. Where is that diocese that would decline the fatherly summons of their bishop to promote Jewish missions? Where is that congregation that would refuse the invitation of their parish priest to give annual aid to the evangelization of the Jews, as a plain Church duty, or a matter of simple obedience to the primary command of Christ. Amongst spiritual and social problems of Church life, what is that question of the day that can be compared with the vital claim of this, which has not already received the earnest deliberation of the Houses of Convocation?

"THOU shalt rise and have mercy upon Zion, for it is time that Thou have mercy upon her, yea, the time is come."

Let me close the subject with a practical application. Let me call for the devotion of an offertory to Jewish work on Good Friday

throughout the vast communion for which I am the representative Bishop in the Holy City. Let our alms and our prayers come up for memorial in behalf of the Jew, meeting his own intercessions. He offers these every Friday in the year over the ancient stones of the boundary wall of Solomon's Temple, and especially on Good Friday, the Friday of his Passover Week. The Church has not yet taught the Jew that after his rejection of the Messiah, He still left to him the first interest in the Gospel.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

I THINK that you will agree with me that, now that our interest has been somewhat stirred by this speech, it would be well for us to hear those speakers who are specially interested in missions to the Jews. Therefore, before calling upon the speakers for the other missions, I will now ask Sir John Kennaway to address you.

ADDRESSES.

(1) To JEWS.

Sir JOHN H. KENNAWAY, Bart., Escot.

WE are asked to consider this evening the Jewish question in regard to missions. What is the problem? We may take it that there are from eight to ten millions of Jews in the world, and as the Bishop has told us, they are returning in large numbers to the Holy Land—the land of their fathers. I believe that a recent census has shown that there are in Jerusalem forty-seven thousand Jews, and in Palestine about one hundred thousand. This question has come very much to the front. No nation exercises so great an influence as the Jewish on the finance, and therefore on the politics, of Europe, and all that follows in their train. And yet this is a nation without a country, without a government, without a home; scattered in every part of the globe, persecuted and despised, while at the same time they are the most powerful witnesses to the fulfilment of prophecy and the truth of revelation. But what is their condition spiritually at the present time? I quote from the *Jewish Chronicle* of only a year ago. It says: "We Jews have nothing. Others may speak on great thought-compelling problems—to us all is a blank—there is nothing for us to do but to be Barmitzvah, live how we like, and make a point of being buried at Willesden." Again, the same paper says: "Except that for once in the twelvemonth he has joined a congregation and said some Hebrew he does not understand, and would not read if he did, what cares the average Jew about anything else on the spiritual side of Judaism? In short, the Jew attends the service in question, and there the matter ends." Not but that there are some Jews, especially among the poorer class, who do feel their position, and who feel a desire for something better.

May I read a prayer called "The Shemoneh Esreh": "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham. Cause us to turn, O our Father, to Thy law, and draw us near, O our King, to Thy service, and restore us in perfect repentance to Thy presence. Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned; pardon us, our King, for we have transgressed. Ready to pardon and forgive Thou art. Look, we beseech Thee, upon our afflictions and plead our cause, and redeem us speedily for the sake of Thy name, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel. Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed; save us, and we shall be saved; for our praise art Thou; and bring forth a perfect remedy unto all our infirmities. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel. O restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and remove from us sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, Thou, O Lord alone, in grace and mercy; and justify us. And to Jerusalem Thy city return with compassion and dwell therein as Thou hast promised; and rebuild her speedily

in our days, a structure everlasting; and the throne of David speedily establish therein. For Thy salvation do we hope daily. O that our eyes may behold Thy return to Zion with mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, Who restored Thy Shekinah unto Zion. Praised be Thou, Lord, for Thou blessest Thy people Israel with salvation." How our minds must re-echo that prayer! But what are we to do for them? If we follow Christ's example, we have to tell them of His salvation and His Kingdom, and we know how S. Paul declared that he was ready to be accursed for the sake of bringing them into the fold, and how at Rome "he expounded and testified to the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets, from morning till evening." We have, then, a clear example duly put before us.

We live in what has been rightly called the century of missions. The missionary torch from England, which was allowed to go out some centuries ago, has been rekindled, and missionary work has been more and more coming to the front. We must, however, remember, that under the orders by which we march the work is to be begun at Jerusalem, and that, by Divine command, we are to preach the Gospel to the Jews first. Therefore, I have no hesitation in claiming for missions to the Jews a foremost position as entitled to the coveted distinction of the Blue Ribbon of missionary effort. I claim this on several grounds—the grounds of obligation, of interest, the promise of blessing, and, what commends itself to Englishmen, on the ground of difficulty. As to the first, the obligation is by Divine command, and by a debt of gratitude and shame. Think what we owe to the Jews! We owe to them our Bible, the chief source of England's greatness. We owe to them the Saviour, born of a Jewish mother, and nursed at a Jewish breast, the Son of Abraham and the Son of David. We ought also to pay to them a debt of shame for what Christianity has done to them—shame, alas, for wrongs done them by England in years gone by—shame for what they are suffering in Christian Europe at this present time, driven forth and treated with every indignity; these are debts I say from Christians to Jews which we must seek to pay. Then, again, what a source of surpassing interest is the study of God's dealings with His people in old times, and the lives of those great men, who, as statesmen, chiefs, kings, law givers, and prophets, made history! Aye, and there are great promises of blessing, too. Is it not written, "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love Thee; blessed be he who blesses Thee?" and I believe we may claim that these promises hold good now, and that the nation is as dear to the Lord Who chose them out as His own inheritance as they were in old days, and that He will bless those who work for them.

Then there is the question of difficulty. You would have thought that missions to the Jews would have been comparatively easy, and that you could convince them very easily by citing to them the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. But it is not easy. Whether from the fear that they would lose their nationality by embracing the faith of Christianity, or whether it arises from their hatred of Christians for their great ill-treatment of them, the fact is that missions to the Jews are by far the most difficult that we have to face now—and I speak from experience of two societies, for Missions to Jews and the Heathen. We know what it must cost them to face the loss of all their connections and friends, when a funeral service is performed on the day of their baptism, and they are mourned as dead among their relations, and the wonder is that any should come out and face consequences so tremendous. Again, there is another and a sad cause, which I hope is becoming less and less, and that is, that many earnest, believing Christians cannot bring themselves to take interest in, or to afford sympathy to, the work. Missions to the Jews have been carried on now for about eighty years, and you will

fairly ask what is being done, or what has been done. The London Jews Society, of which I can speak with authority, has, at the present moment, one hundred and thirty-three missionaries, clerical and lay, and seventy-three of these are Christian Israelites. In 1893 the Jews were spoken to in two hundred and twenty-three cities of Europe, Asia, and Africa. The result of careful inquiry by a missionary, who has a claim to be not only an historian, but a statistician, is that one hundred thousand Hebrews have been baptized in the course of the present century. Taking our own Church, there were known two years ago to be one hundred and thirty-six ordained clergymen, formerly Jews, and it is not too much to say that there are two hundred in the ministry at the present time, and three of them have become bishops. The Hebrew Christian Prayer Union in London now numbers something like six hundred members. The world taunts us with failure, says that it costs so much to convert a Jew, and that money has been wasted, and next they talk of wasted lives in foreign missions. I will not bandy statistics; I will not enter into controversy as to the number of converts, though I feel it my duty to state what I know. You must remember, in the words of Archbishop Magee, that "our Lord has not sent us forth to conquer the world (He will do that at His own time and in His own way), but to preach His gospel as a witness to all nations. What we are concerned with is not success, but the faithfulness of our ministry." I am glad to say, however, that the interest is increasing more and more. The Jewish question is coming to the front, and we may congratulate those who have drawn up the programme of this week on the fact that it is the first time, as I believe, Jewish missions have had a place in a Church Congress. Satisfied with that, I will ask you now to join with me in prayer for the prosperity of this great work. O God of peace, Who brought from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, make us perfect in every good work to do Thy will; show us, we beseech Thee, what we may do for Israel Thy people. They know not Thy Son; they fear not Thy name; set before us an open door that we may show Thy people their transgressions, and the House of Jacob their sin; to the glory of Thy name, to the salvation of Thy ancient people. Pardon our past iniquity, and quicken us, and quicken them, for Thy name's sake, O God.

The Rev. MICHAEL ROSENTHAL, Missioner of the East London Mission to the Jews, 87, Commercial Road, E.

I AM thankful to find that, after a silence of thirteen years, the Church Congress has once more taken up the Jewish subject, and I feel happy in being again permitted to take part in it. If there is one Christian enterprise more conducive to the vital interests of the Church than another, it is mission work among the unconverted of all nations, including the Jews, of course; for no universal missionary effort is possible which does not embrace the Hebrews.

But owing to certain misconceptions, there are many who recognize the imperative obligation to engage in missions to the heathen, yet stand aloof from missions to the Jews. Some think that as the Jews possess Moses and the prophets, they have no need of the Gospel. But surely this is a fallacy. Mosaic Judaism is no longer practicable. In the synagogue the Jews bemoan their loss of Church privileges in these words: —"We have neither temple nor altar, neither priesthood nor sacrifices." The Judaism of the ancient Hebrew Church was purely sacerdotal and sacrificial, and it came to an end when the Jerusalem temple was destroyed. Modern Judaism has very little, if anything, in common with the Levitical law. It consists chiefly of boundless traditions, compiled during several centuries, by honest but misguided Rabbins. Besides, Christianity is not merely a system for civilizing and humanizng savages, it is equally needed by the most cultured and refined of mankind. Jews and Gentiles alike stand in need of Christ, Who alone is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life" (S. John xiv. 6).

Some Christians neglect Jewish missions because they argue that the miraculous preservation of the Jews as a distinct people, notwithstanding that they have been scattered among all the nations of the earth for many long centuries, betokens that God has not yet done with them, but as the Bible leads us to believe, there is a glorious future in store for them, and that a time is coming when all Israel shall be saved. All this is quite true, but surely the blessed Apostles must have known that in God's own good time all Israel shall be saved. S. Paul must have known this, for it is he who specially asserts this truth (Rom. xi. 26), and yet wherever he came he delivered the message of salvation to the Jews—*to the Jews first.*

The Divine purpose and our obligation are distinct. Again, we know by the analogy of God's dealings with Israel in the past, that He condescends to employ human instrumentality for the achievement of His object; and what reason have we to doubt that He expects the Church to prepare His ancient people for that great event, when the Jews shall look upon Him Whom they have pierced, mourn for their sins (Zech. xii. 10), be pardoned and reconciled to God? By energetic work and fervent prayer the Lord may permit us to hasten on that blessed state which Israel's conversion will usher into the world, and which S. Paul calls, "even life from the dead" (Rom. xi. 15).

Some people are deterred from engaging in missionary effort to the Jews by the difficult nature of this particular work. That this work is very arduous no one will deny. The Jews, who are proud of their origin, intellectual attainments, and ever-increasing worldly prosperity and power, resist vehemently any attempt at proselytizing among them. If the missioner is to do his duty by them without fear or favour, he must be prepared to lead a life of daily martyrdom; and this is most particularly the case when the missioner happens to be himself a convert from Judaism.

But although this mission is difficult, it is by no means an impossible work, and it is our bounden duty to carry it on. Whatever Gentile Christians may think of Christ's command "to begin at Jerusalem," to the mind of a Hebrew Christian the terms of His commission to the Church are too explicit to admit of a doubt. I feel sure that we can never engage in any mission with greater certainty that we are acting according to the mind and will of our Divine Master, than when we are making efforts to bring to Him some of the "lost sheep of the House of Israel" (Matt. x. 6 and xv. 24).

As a matter of fact, the Church is gaining annually far more converts from the Jews than from the heathens, comparatively speaking. Baptisms of Jews are now of such frequent occurrence that they no longer attract the attention they used to do in former years. I am right glad that this is the case, for it is most undesirable to make a parade of the encouraging results which God vouchsafes to our labours. Still, the Church Congress ought to know that every *rightful* effort made for the conversion of the Jews is being blessed with visible tokens of Divine favour.

In London, we are now having vast opportunities for conversing with the Jews, and the Lord is graciously blessing our efforts in converting many of them. In the Providence of God, mission work among the Jews has been my vocation for the past twenty-two years. For the last eighteen years I have been working among my brethren in London, chiefly in the east of the Metropolis. In the mission under my charge at Stepney, we have regular Sunday and weekly services, a congregation with a roll of communicants, our lay-helpers, our representatives in the rural deanery, one of whom is also a member of the Diocesan Conference. We have our own guilds and clubs, and all the ordinary machinery of a small parish, and all entirely and exclusively Hebrew Christians. Whilst in addition we have meetings for enquirers and catechumens, Sunday schools, mothers' meetings, classes for discussion, and meetings for all sorts and conditions of Jews. And the result shows that the Gospel

of Jesus Christ has in no wise lost its savour through the lapse of centuries; it is still fresh and edifying, it is now, as ever, "the power of God unto salvation to every-one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Rom. i. 16).

One of the difficulties in connection with Jewish missions is that we often meet with some cases of a most perplexing nature. As a missionary to the Jews, with twenty-two years' experience, I would venture to suggest to some of my younger brethren to demand of every Jewish candidate for baptism, to give a lucid and convincing "reason of the hope that is in him" (1 Pet. iii. 15), before administering to him the Holy Sacrament. Conviction may not, perhaps, be accompanied by conversion in every single instance, but in the case of Jews it invariably precedes it. Humanly speaking, a Jew cannot be converted to the Faith before he is convinced in his own mind of the Messiahship and Godhead of our Blessed Lord; and when he is thus convinced, with a few very rare exceptions, he is able to show his conviction to others, however illiterate he may be.

Most of the orthodox Jews, from whom the largest number of converts is drawn, may, as a rule, be convinced of the truth of Christianity by a reverent, literal, and judicious exposition of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament. Some of the reformed Jews may be brought to see—in the fulfilment of Christ's prophecies respecting the destruction of the Holy City and the Temple, and the establishment of the Catholic Church, notwithstanding all opposition, in addition to His own spotless and matchless character—that His claims to the Messiahship and Godhead were just and true. Some Jews find in the errors of the Talmud, by contrasting them with the sublime teaching of Christ, the most convincing arguments in favour of the Divine origin and inspiration of the Gospel.

In the course of my missionary career I have had to deal with several very learned Jews, whom at first no argument could reconcile to the doctrine of the adorable Trinity; but when I showed to them in the Zohar (Zohar vol. 2, page 43, one of the most ancient of the Cabalistic books) that Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai, a contemporary of S. Paul, taught that the Godhead comprised Three Spirits, namely, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they became convinced and were eventually baptized. By the way, it is impossible to read the ancient Cabalistic books without coming to the conclusion that the doctrine of a Triune Jehovah must have been a fundamental article of Faith in the Hebrew Church before the Christian era.

The most difficult part, however, is not so much to convince a Jew of the truth of Christianity, as to arouse in him a spirit of enquiry. There is a tendency in the Jewish mind to rest satisfied with the religious system to which, through circumstances, he became endeared, and to associate with it a general notion of the Divine approval. He argues that since it has pleased God "to suspend Ancient Judaism," and to suffer the Jews to have for their religion only a few conventional rites and ceremonies, that state of religion is one to which it may not be wrong for him to adhere; and so long as he is in a position to observe those rites and ceremonies, it is most difficult to bring him to see that even if his tenets were sound, his argument in support of them is not more convincing than that which any benighted Pagan can adduce in favour of his own superstition. When a spirit of enquiry has been once aroused in the mind of a Jew, then any devout Christian who is familiar with the controversy between the Church and the synagogue is competent to instruct him in the faith. But in order to arouse in him a spirit of enquiry, *to set him thinking*, it requires a thorough knowledge of Judaism and the Jews, their aspirations and phases of thought.

About twelve years ago, a poor Jew applied to me for baptism. Finding on examination that he had never read the New Testament, and that he was still labouring under all the Jewish prejudices against the Saviour and His religion, I asked what induced him to seek for baptism. To this he answered with evident simplicity

and truthfulness, that in a moment of great emergency he had been obliged to part with his phylacteries and fringes, and fancying that without those sacred emblems of Judaism he could neither observe his religious duties nor remain an acceptable member of the synagogue, he had therefore decided to embrace Christianity, rather than lead an irreligious life. After listening to the account he gave of himself, I came to the conclusion that to set him thinking would be the best service I could render him, and in order to effect that purpose, I had better say nothing to him on that occasion about the respective merits of Judaism and Christianity. Accordingly, after giving him a little money for the purchase of his religious emblems and some stock in trade, I exhorted him to remain faithful to the God of his fathers, and pray for more light. As I anticipated, my action was an inexplicable enigma to him, and when he left me he looked quite bewildered. Before a year had elapsed, during which time his circumstances had much improved, he paid me another visit. I then persuaded him to join my instruction classes, and in due time he was baptized. Before his first Communion, he told me "that nothing could have more effectually uprooted his native prejudices against Christianity and Jewish converts than the way I treated him when he first called upon me." Ever since his baptism, about ten years ago, he has led a life of harmony and consistency with his Christian profession. Since his conversion he has been the means of bringing several Jews to Christ. When a Jew embraces the Faith, he becomes instinctively and by force of circumstances a missionary to his brethren. The very process of defending his act of leaving the synagogue is itself preaching the Gospel; and we have had many instances of converts who gave themselves no rest until they had brought some of their relatives to the Faith, with the never-failing argument of personal experience: "We have found the Messiah . . . come and see" (S. John i. 41, 46).

Some persons object to Jewish missions because they are obnoxious to the Jews, who, we are told, "have a right to their conscience"; *certainly*, but so have other people, and so have Christians. It is not to the Jews alone that the Cross of Christ is a stumbling block and rock of offence. If unbelieving Jews resent our missionary efforts on their behalf, we ought to point out to them in all loving sympathy, that the teaching of Christ must beget in every heart in which its real power is known, an earnest longing for the Gospel message to reach all nations, it is therefore impossible for Christians to ignore the nation from which Christ came (Heb. ii. 16).

To the honour and glory of England, be it said, that Her Majesty's Jewish subjects enjoy perfect liberty and quietude throughout the whole world-wide British Empire, and as the Jews love, therefore, the English people, the Anglican Communion is sure to meet with greater success in Jewish missions than any other branch of the Catholic Church. Our opportunities for preaching the Gospel to them are very great. In London alone there are many thousands of Jews. Now would it be right if Christian people, who, in obedience to Christ's command, are sending missionaries to the uttermost parts of the earth, should neglect the Jews who live in their midst and next door to the Church of God? Loyal servants of Christ cannot, and will not, remain indifferent and utterly callous to the eternal welfare of the Jews, who, according to the flesh, are the very brethren of our Divine Redeemer. Although in His inscrutable Providence the Lord may defer the national conversion of the Jews until His second coming, yet He graciously allows us to win for the Church daily "a remnant of Israel according to the election of grace" (Rom. ix. 27; xi. 5). And this is about all that the Church is at present permitted to accomplish among other nations, namely, to gather a people out of the world, a Church out of all nations, a people for Christ's name, and whom "He will present faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy" (Jude 24). But when all Israel shall be saved, then shall the mission field really and truly flourish, for then the "earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea" (Isaiah xi. 9).

PAPER.

(2) To Japanese.

The Rev. Geo. Ensor, Vicar of Peel and Rural Dean.

With scarce less suddenness than the outflaming of the meteor flash there has appeared above our horizon, has traversed with vivid velocity large space of our political sky, and shows yet no symptom of waning, this power out of the East, which we call Japan. This little horn has waxed swiftly strong and grown exceeding great. These people of the morning land—Who are they, and whence came they?

If those who have passed furthest in the path of racial pilgrimage be they who started first, we might expect that even contrary to all linguistic preconceptions we should discover in Japan a tongue not distantly allied to the cradle speech of the race. We should, if we may rise superior to our literary prejudices, search for affinity between the utterances of Nineveh and of Nihón.

And not unsuccessfully. I have tabulated a considerable number of root identifications between Japanese and Hebrew and submitted them to the judgment of one whose Oriental fame was as eminent as the greatness of his heart and the kindness of his life, I mean the late Dean of Canterbury; one by me much lamented. He recognized their affinity; indeed, endorsed their identity. Independently I tracked the stream still nearer to its source, and discovered that the correspondence between the Japanese and older Assyrian was, if possible, more startling and more minute.

I am told the facts of ethnology are all against me here. I am only sorry for the facts. At this early point, then, of enquiry the people of Japan have in their language contributed evidence to the unity of human speech and, by consequence, to the identity of the race.

But points of contact are there even not less striking between the ancient traditions of Japan and Babylon. The much revered volume of the Nihon-shō-ki, which contains the primitive records of Japan, commences with the remarkable statement that in the beginning there were three gods, and these three gods became one and concealed themselves. I have argued with the Japanese, herein is much truth. It is true that in the beginning there were Three Persons in one God, and it is true that though They did not arbitrarily conceal themselves, yet that when man sinned God withdrew His presence from our first parents, and they on their part did not desire to retain Him in their memory, their obedience, and their love. But the statement of a Trinity is very closely allied to the ancient Accadian tradition. Professor Sayce points out that the only genuine Trinity that can be discovered in the religious faith of early Chaldæa was that old Accadian system which conceived of a divine father and mother by the side of their child, the Sun-god. There would arise at once the reflection, entirely in consonance with other facts, that the progenitors of the Japanese had parted company with the early race ancestors before the influence of Babylonian ideas had availed to mould their later theological conceptions. The shape, indeed, of the Japanese tradition which I have cited will of itself indicate its existence earlier and more primitive than the later and more degraded Babylonian.

I venture here to suggest correction to one of Professor Sayce's

arguments, usually most brilliant, commonly most precarious. In his Hibbert Lectures he has very interestingly indicated the existence of the ark or ship in which the gods and their symbols were carried in religious processions. The Professor connects the occurrence of these arks or ships with the ark of the Bible, indeed derives the latter from the former. He asserts that in the Biblical account of the deluge the ship of the Babylonian version has become an ark; but the Japanese Mi-kōshi, or sacred ark, which I suggest is more ancient than the Babylonian, is not a ship, but more in the form of the Biblical ark, and by consequence, the Biblical shape and conception of the ark is more primitive than the Babylonian.

Yet one further instruction does Japan in its language supply. The sign-character, changeless and unalterable, at least hitherto, of China has stamped and sealed its writing, which constitutes for it as for all peoples the channels of their thought, with an intolerable and fatal immobility. Intelligence has been stifled in its transmission through such a medium, national progress delayed and defeated, a spiritual advance almost absolutely stayed. Was there not a similar and not less deadly incapacity in the Assyrian language to improve? In Babylon and in Pekin the passage from the sign-writing to the syllable or letter-writing came not. Attempts, abortive, imperfect, inadequate, were made in both; in both they failed. As to the former, it was not until the new Babylonian period that a growing preference was shown for the signs representing the simple syllables (consonant and vowel, or vowel and consonant), but even then they were not exclusively employed, and in any case the preference came—too late. (*Delitzsch*, Assyr. Gram., p. 16.) Was it not that God intended to prepare the channels and watercourse of the Abrahamic people for the reception and transmission of revelation. Thus light spiritual and light secular travelled in parallel streams along the path which Providence prepared. A development of the race proceeded, but only along the chosen route. It was not so much the selection of the fittest, but the adaptation to be the fittest.

The old China has failed as a civilizer, and the white flag that waved from the battlement of Port Arthur told the triumphs of the new order. Yet, strange to say, Japan, indebted almost absolutely to China for its literature, has advanced in its development of a syllabic, almost an alphabetic, writing. Before our own Education Act of 1870 probably more Japanese men and women, relatively, could read in Japan than in England. This was due to their syllabic system—their I, ro, ha, as they term it, as we name our own alphabet our a, b, c. So Japan when she entered China the other day was equipped as an intellectual instrument of enlightenment as thoroughly as she was in her outfit of Maxims and Lee-Metfords. She has ended the old China; she has introduced the new. Not France, not Russia, not Germany, not China herself can cause the path to be retraced. "The old things have passed away," and we, with our Christian expectation for both Japan and China, can with joyful language of hope add "all things have become new."

If each new territory of heathenism invaded by the entrance of Christianity has some contribution of witness to offer to its conqueror, some peculiar tribute to his name, then Japan is no exception to this law. For, first, we see in the history of Japan the character of heathenism isolated so substantially as it has been by its insular character from

contact with those influences of Christianity which so often mitigate the harshness and ameliorate the acerbity of heathenism in localities which they are as yet unable to regenerate and sanctify.

We find, for example, Confucianism, established for many centuries in Japan, received into an enthusiastic and generous soil. We see its teachings identified with some of the best thoughts in Japan, as its literature has been the vehicle in large measure and the stimulus alike of the culture of Japan. We see the sage honoured with a reverence scarce, if at all, short of the homage of his own people, but we see Confucius helpless to sanctify by his sayings the people of his adoption. The moral fibre in Japan has not been invigorated; the family life, represented in the respect and honour of the woman, has not been strengthened by the fruitless aphorisms of "the Master." Out of the mire and the clay of darkened thought and degraded conception of social life Confucius has been powerless to elevate Japan. If it be conceded to his teaching the possible strengthening of the filial relation, the encouragement of that solitary grace has been more than compensated for by the absolute absence of restraining influence upon the parent, absence of prohibition from the most awful crime of which they have been guilty with respect to them.

Or again, if the progress of Buddhism in Japan be considered in the past. There do we see this Indian exotic transplanted into the stove heat of the fiery and fervid temperament of this singular people. We see its course there something after the manner of a royal progress. We view its vitality there as transcending far that of Buddhism in either India or China. We see it seated on the throne and established in the most gorgeous shrines and fanes of its people. We contemplate its priests and votaries in uncounted thousands occupying the unique position of being the sole depositaries of any teaching touching any future state. We see, likewise, culture of a certain kind coming in with Buddhism into Japan, the literature of China and the language even of India in the Pali flowing through the channel of this faith into the far-off field of Japan. But from all this, what has come? No uplifting of the ethical characteristics of the people of Japan. The social life is untouched by both the culture and the faith of Buddhism. While some of its priests are eminent for mental attainment, so far as a congeries of mingling inanities and insanities may furnish material or machinery for thought, indubitable evidence indicates that their morality is lower than the low normal depths of dark depressed Japan.

As a sanctifying influence Buddhism is a splendid failure in Japan. There have we the ethical object lesson on the largest and the most conspicuous scale. There view we its operation, and there do we discern its absolute and hopeless inefficiency. If morality be admitted even as a factor of importance in the testing and scrutiny of a faith, then the hand of history inscribes upon the temple halls of Japan, in letters that need no miracle-taught Hebrew to decipher, that in the balances has Buddhism been weighed, and wanting has she been found.

Or view all the creeds of Japan in their separate or conspiring streams of philanthropy, what have they done for the ignorant aborigines of the northern isle of Yezzo? I have conversed with its inhabitants twenty years ago, and at that date through all their land no Buddhist shrine nor Confucian temple received the strange worshippers, nor did the state creed of Shinto ever dream of condescending from its dignity to

their need. No priest instructed, and no teacher taught them. The vaunted mission spirit of Buddhism found there no encouragement of royal Asoka to encourage, or lucrative revenue to enrich. To-day the language of the Ainu is studied in the libraries of European learning through the pages of Mr. Bachelor, the representative of the Church Missionary Society. But better, infinitely far, than the classification of its declensions is the inclusion of those who employ it within the gates of the Christian Church. In the year 1891, only nine had been baptized of these strange, savage people; last year four hundred were ranked under the banner of the King of Grace. What have the sages of India and China through centuries of occupation in Japan done for the Ainu? What has the Christian Faith in these its infant years among them accomplished? This is indeed the finger of God, and this the evidence of the unique and solitary glory of the everlasting Gospel.

But it may be submitted that after all Christianity may exercise but superficial influence over the people of Japan. It may be contended that the desire of culture and a sensitiveness to the public opinion of the great peoples of the Occident may have stimulated Japan to adopt the livery of a creed associated with the prestige of the dominant races of the world. It may be urged that the late war gave ghastly disclosure of the savage character and condition of the Japanese. It may be contended that the tale of rapine and massacre told in the annals of that campaign threw lurid and significant lustre on the unregenerate temperament of that people. Admitting for argumentative purposes that the tale with all its horror be absolutely true, what does it all prove? It shows that the Japanese army and people, with yet but a most limited percentage of Christians within them, too few to exercise but a minimum of restrictive and temperating influence, were guilty of crimes that found most adequate and respectable parallels in the Franco-German War of 1870. Does not the student of military history remember the incidents that led to the destruction of the French town of Bazeilles. Or, passing to the not far off point of 1795, just a century ago, who that is acquainted with European history can suppose that the desperate deeds of savagery and inhumanity of the French then enacted could be well transcended by any of the excesses and cruelties of the late campaign.

But even in a field so unfavourable for their exhibition, there did appear in the late war illustrations of the sanctifying and softening influence of the Christian faith. It is delightful to mark the readiness with which Japanese soldiers received copies of God's word on their departure from their country for the front. One of the lady workers of the Church Missionary Society received a letter from four of these soldiers, saying that they four met daily for the reading of the sacred Book.

I met in the Isle of Man with a letter from a young officer of marines, who, writing home, mentioned to his friends that the day after the Japanese occupied Ninghai, a small town about twenty miles from Chefoo, some of their soldiers discovered a little Protestant chapel or church. The result was that during the rest of the Japanese stay there the Christian soldiers used it regularly, dropping in daily for sermon and prayer, and sitting down quite promiscuously among the Chinese worshippers. They frequently borrowed books to read, he writes, and the property of the church was left untouched.

How vast, how far-reaching, will, in the near future, become the influence of such a power in Eastern Asia, it is difficult to foretell.

In the opening phrase of the Queen's Speech, the case of two sick men was referred to—the invalid Turk of the lesser, and the incurable China of the larger, continent. If the ending of her ancient *status quo* be for China the only mending, and if one result of the late war be, for offensive and defensive purposes, an enormous development of the military and naval power of Japan, if as consequence of her even partial but steadily progressive possession of Christianity, much more even than as result of her recent sanguinary triumphs, the influence of Japan in China be far penetrating and permanent, then shall all who have favoured Missions to Japan rejoice, and, borrowing fresh impulse from the large promise of the day to come, enter to prosecute the mission toil in that country with redoubled energy, prayerfulness, and love.

ADDRESS.

(2) To Japanese.

The Rev. H. J. Foss, S.P.G. Missionary to Kobê, Japan.

What I have to say must be considered as supplementary to the eloquent words of Mr. Ensor, who has dealt with this subject so fully. No doubt the reason this subject has been selected for discussion is the success which Japan has achieved during the late war with China, and it is for us Christians to consider whether it is a time when we should make special efforts, and whether it is a time when Japan may be more ready to listen than she was before. I think to both those questions we must give an affirmative answer. Japan has been for some time unsettled, especially as to its religions, and they have felt very much, on account of the education which has been going on during late years, the unsatisfactory nature both of Shintooism and of Buddhism. The Buddhist priests have tried to engraft Christian teaching on the old Buddhist doctrines, and have even, for instance, tried to teach the doctrine of creation, but their attempts have been of no avail. The old religions of Japan, it was once remarked to me by a native Christian, are like an empty snail shell upon a wall; you see crowds gathering in the temples, and hear of thousands of dollars being subscribed for the rebuilding and ornamentation of those temples; but there is no life in the religions, and they are only clinging to the wall from old association. One of the leading politicians of Japan, who is the head of a large school or college, and the editor of a paper which may be called *The Times* of Japan, said he thought at one time, as a patriotic Japanese, it was his duty to try and strengthen Buddhism as the chief religion of the country. But he said he had found it of no use; and he has now long opened his school to Christian teachers, and he has in editorials, and privately to his friends, said that Christianity is the only religion possible for the civilization of the people, and for the raising of Japan among the comity of nations. Then again, not only in the old days, three hundred years ago, when S. Francis Xavier went to Japan, but in comparatively modern times, Christianity was feared and distrusted in Japan. The people said, when English, French, Americans, and Russians came and preached their religion, that it was only a preparation for taking the country for themselves. But those ideas have, I hope, died out, and Christianity is known to be a good religion, and Christian people—Christian men and women—are now expected to be, and are generally found to be, good men and women, and they have been proved as loyal as even the most patriotic Japanese. I remember calling upon the Prefect of Hiogo with our first bishop, and he said, "Tell your bishop that I have been glad to see the progress of Christianity in this city, because I have found the high morality it teaches is of the greatest benefit, not only to its adherents, but also to the whole population." And I may say that the change of the attitude of the

Government towards Christianity during late years has been mainly owing to the good conduct of the Christians, as their numbers have gradually increased.

Latest advices from Japan seem to show that the Japanese are still so excited about the war and its results that they have no thought for anything else, but we cannot fail to see that the ultimate tendency must be that they will be led to listen to the religion of Western nations. They have posed before the world as advocates of civilization as it prevails in Europe, they have won their great successes on account of their following Western ideas and Western science in war and other matters, and there is no doubt that if Christianity is put before them as the only foundation of true civilization, they will be ready to listen to us. You have heard that that is even now the tendency. In the army, only a few years ago, no private soldier was allowed to possess a book. Christianity was scouted because it taught people to love their enemies, which was not at all the right thing for soldiers to do. But now that is changed, and in Tokio Christian missions have opened reading rooms for the soldiers to attend. In the navy we have branches of the Christian Endeavour Society, and not only do they assemble to encourage each other, but they take every opportunity to speak about Christianity to their fellow-sailors. We have a large and flourishing Red Cross Society in heathen Japan, with a prince of the royal blood as its president, and with the same sacred sign of the order as at home. Foreign missionaries have been allowed to circulate books and pictures to the sick and wounded in the hospitals; native deacons of our own Church and others were allowed during the war to go to the front and to visit the hospitals as voluntary chaplains; and hundreds and thousands of portions of the Scriptures have been allowed to be given to the soldiers and officers by colporteurs. It has been said it is hopeless to teach the Japanese Christianity, because they are turning to the atheism and agnosticism of America and Europe. That may be true of the student classes in certain cases, but there are hundreds and thousands of the natives who are willing to give Christianity a fair and unbiassed hearing. I have often seen large halls and theatres crowded with not-yet believers—as we call them in Japan—who listen, sometimes noisily, but oftener quietly, to many and long addresses on Christianity; and I constantly meet thinking people in the country districts as I go about who have read their Bibles and Christian books, and who show, in other ways, that they are very willing indeed to listen to the teachings of Christianity.

England, of all nations, has the greatest duty towards Japan at present in this matter. During the war England was very unpopular, and for reasons which to some must have appeared very ludicrous. But now the Japanese are favourable to us. Not only did England not try to put pressure, as did Russia, Germany, and France, upon Japan after the war, but before the war began, England was the first of the nations to sign the long looked for treaty of commerce, which gave Japan far more privileges and advantages than she looked for, and which placed her second to no European nation. Anyone who thinks of that will be inclined to listen to the voice of England. One clause of that treaty will in five years permit any Englishman to live in any part of Japan, and the necessity for passports will be done away with. Now, it takes two or three years to learn the language; and surely it will be our duty to be ready when that time comes to place efficient missions in every prefecture in the country of Japan. Another reason why we should exert ourselves is the present condition of our Church in Japan. In the last synod—for we have regular synods to discuss Church matters in Japan—certain territorial limits were fixed, and the Northern and Southern islands of Yezo and Kiushiu having been already formed into separate dioceses, the main island was divided into four missionary districts, for two of which the American Church, and for the other two the English Church, are responsible. At the first meeting of the American Mission Church after that decision,

it was determined to send home an urgent request that eleven more missionaries should be sent out, that they might have one in each of the eleven chief towns in their districts. The English Church is responsible for twenty-five millions of the people of Japan, and they will not be evangelized by the Church at all, unless from England. We are now very thinly manned, and in my own district of Kobê, where there are a million and a half of people, we have only two mission priests and one native deacon. In the island of Shikoku, just south of us, there are four provinces with over three millions of people, and only one province is yet occupied by a Church mission.

I once asked a Japanese scholar, who writes very well, to give me a specimen of his handwriting. I have it still, and it hangs up in my little room at home. The words were: "Opportunity, how hard to gain, how easy to lose. Though thy heart may regret, how shalt thou overtake it." Is it not marvellous that Japan, which was once more closely shut up than any other country, is now more open to civilization than any other Eastern nation? She is turning away from her old ideas, and her old religions; she is turning to Western ideas and to Western thought. Before her people become hardened to all religion, before they have become content with negation of religion, let us see to it that we realize that it is God who has opened this door for us, and determine to enter in for Christ and for His Church.

PAPER.

(3) To Chinese.

The Right Rev. George E. Moule, D.D., Missionary Bishop of Mid China.

(1) The recent cruel and cowardly murder of our missionaries at Kucheng, following so quickly upon the collapse of the Chinese military system under the skilfully delivered Japanese invasion, has given occasion to criticisms of the Chinese national character, usually unfavourable, perhaps sometimes ungenerous, if not unfair. A nation so hostile to strangers and so truculent, that nothing but chance or a special providence preserves any foreign resident from a murderous attack; an inherent deficiency of everything that makes a soldier,—courage, docility, *ésprit de corps*, and loyalty; such are some of the deductions one has heard from the deplorable and disgraceful tragedy of August, and from the more protracted spectacle of national disaster afforded by China during the past and current year. Even old residents in China have been found to assert, as of their own knowledge, that cruelty, elsewhere unexampled, is universal in China, and that there does not exist in the Chinese race even the pretence of manliness, truthfulness, or loyalty.

(2) Many years' sojourn on Chinese soil in familiar intercourse with, especially, the lower orders, have convinced me that it is a hazardous experiment to construct any single formula which shall do fair justice to the national character of three hundred millions of mankind, inhabiting an empire nearly as entensive as Europe, and who, during the eighteen centuries of the development of Christianity in the West, have been practically shut up to the influence of a multiform paganism, partly indigenous, partly exotic. So far as Christianity can be said to have made an impression in China, it is comparable, perhaps, to the modifying influence in Christendom of Mohammedanism and Judaism; only the latter two have, during the period in view, been represented by a far larger number of votaries in Europe than Christians in China ever reached.

(3) That the Chinese national character is not one to be dismissed with a phrase is obvious to all who know and reflect on, not only the disgraces and inhumanities already referred to, nor, in addition, only the tolerated or sanctioned cruelties, *e.g.*, of judicial torture, or the distortion of the female foot in obedience to social custom, but other and much more characteristic features of the subject. Such are the extent of territory, and the vast population which has been held, with temporary exceptions, in orderly subjection, under one imperial rule for eighteen centuries, the extent and quality of the national literature, the ethical teaching which constitutes a large part of it, the very early development of agriculture, arts, and commerce at home, and the recognized influence of China as a pioneer of civilization among her neighbours, notably in Japan, which, mainly through her intelligent adoption of the material civilization of the West, has just been able to inflict so crushing a defeat on her ancient teacher and suzerain.

(4) Already at the beginning of the Christian era, the frontier of China proper, as distinct from tributary territories like Mongolia, Thibet, or Tonquin, was nearly co-extensive with its present outline. Then, as now, it included Pekin on the north and Canton in the south, and had for its eastern limit the shores of the China Sea, for its western the mountain marches which intervene between China and Thibet or Mongolia. All within those wide limits were children of Han; in contrast to the less civilized Mongol and Manchow beyond the passes; the Thibetans, the Annamese, and Burmans; or the Shans and other mountaineers of the south-west and south. They were ruled according to one statute law, administered by officials subordinated on one system to the central authority. Already in the earlier centuries of the era, moral and intellectual culture was encouraged by the imperial recognition of Confucianist doctrine, which was disseminated in print before the invention of printing in Europe, and was taught in the common schools, whose results were tested by public examination and the graduation of successful scholars.

(5) *Confucianism.*—The basis of the Confucianist Ethics is the virtuous instinct inherent in all men; virtue being sub-divided as charity, relative duty, propriety, fidelity, and knowledge; and applied in the filial, fraternal, and conjugal relations, together with those of friend to friend, and of the state-servant to the sovereign. Amongst the most conspicuous *dicta* of the great Master—who flourished in the latter half of the sixth and beginning of the fifth centuries B.C.—were those that inculcated *on the son* an absolute devotion to the service of his parents, to their maintenance during life, and the provision of sacrificial honours for their *manes* after death; *on the daughter* a similar devotion till her marriage, when it must be transferred to her husband's parents, and, in subordination to them, to himself; on the *friend*, unswerving fidelity to his friend's service—since "Without good faith how can human relations subsist?"; on the *Minister of State* unstinted loyalty, which, however, upon occasion would dictate remonstrance against the prince's errors rather than obsequious compliance.

The weakness of the system lies in the absence of a personal deity as the origin and sanction of its maxims. Heaven, no doubt, the later representative of a more personal conception of God in earlier days,

was held to have infused in every man his moral nature, and to bestow upon elect individuals their gifts of kingship or of teaching. But heaven has no attributes to attract the love or trust of mankind, not even of the emperor, the only adequate worshipper of Heaven. The doctrine of personal immortality is not less absent from the Confucianist lore than that of a personal God, Father, and Saviour of mankind. Thus, practically without hope and without God, the moral principle wants its strongest support under trial. Already during the great teacher's life-time he lamented the lack of examples of consistent virtue; and it is the less wonderful if, in later and laxer days, the very professors of his religion are often illustrations rather of what he condemned than what he inculcated. In fact the influential minority of Chinese, at whose door lies the responsibility no less for the atrocities of Kucheng and the violence of Chêntu, than for the corruption and cowardice which betrayed China to the Japanese, in a war of aggression on their part, is drawn, beyond doubt, from the educated and official class—the very men most thoroughly imbued, so far as concerns the letter, with the teachings of humanity, justice, and faith, which distinguish, though not without defect, the Confucianist ethical code. It was this class, as officials, whose cowardice, only exceeded by their corruption and conceit, betrayed, in the face of the enemy, at once the troops and costly armaments entrusted to them; and it is the same class which excites and suborns the ignorant masses and the professional ruffians to the sack of missionary establishments and the murder of the missionaries.

The massacre at Kucheng has, indeed, been attributed to a religious community styled vegetarian. Such communities are known in all parts of China. They are off-shoots from Buddhism, of which faith abstinence from animal food is a tenet, because of the equal sacredness of all animal life. They are always viewed with suspicion by the magistrates as semi-political cliques, much as the Cathari and other sects were regarded by the civil, hardly less than by the ecclesiastical, authorities of mediæval Europe.

(6) *Buddhism.*—Buddhism entered China in the first years of the Christian era, brought by Indian Missionaries at the invitation, it is said, of a Chinese Emperor. Confucianism is essentially secularist, and has hazarded no opinion with regard to a future life. Buddhism sets its votaries the task of individually conquering desire and its issues in sin and suffering; in the first place, each man for himself, ultimately for the benefit of the sufferers in "the myriad hells." Buddhism has no special teaching for the family or the State. Its ideal is renunciation of, retirement from, the "mundane dust." Strictly speaking, the true Buddhist is a celibate vegetarian, a hermit or a cœnobite, for whom perfection is sought in the direction of a more and more complete altruism. If Confucius avowed ignorance of any life but the present, Buddhism taught the virtual immortality of the individual, through the endless series of embodiments, already worn or to be worn hereafter, in the process of metempsychosis. Salvation, for the instructed Buddhist, is not life but the pause of Nirvâna, reward of absolute virtue which has at length brought to an end the perpetual revolution of "the wheel of existence." In Buddhism, even less than in the teaching of Confucius, is there any revelation or tradition of God, any promise of a "hope full of immortality." The

vegetarian sects are the symptoms partly of a revolt against the corruption of society, and especially of the monastic orders, partly of the patriotic desire to replace the reigning Manchow family by a native Chinese Emperor. Mr. Watters, an able linguist, and member of the consular service in China, formerly stationed at Fuhchow, expressed, in a communication to the papers, his doubt as to the complicity of the Vegetarians, *as a community*, in the outrage at Kucheng. His language, as I read it, pointed to the idea that it was the deed of ruffians loosely connected with the sect, through circumstances growing out of a recent conflict between it and the Government. The investigation which is proceeding may corroborate this view or confute it. I have certainly known the population of a district of Chêchiang, where Vegetarians were numerous, actively hostile to their neighbours who became Christians.

(7) *Taoism.*—The third ingredient in the composite religious opinions of China is Taoism, the religion of Tao, or the Way. Its founder, Laotsŭ, was contemporary during part of his life with Confucius. It is a moot point with Chinese critics, as with European students, whether in the Tao-tĕ-ching, the solitary work ascribed to him, we have more or less of his genuine teachings. It is agreed that much of it is spurious; and in order to obtain a trustworthy presentation of Taoist doctrine, recourse is had rather to the philosophical chapters of Chwangtsŭ, who flourished in the third and fourth centuries B.C. Chwangtsŭ,* in the readable English version by Mr. Giles, presents a striking contrast to the Confucian teaching of the "Analects"† in other respects, and especially in the frequent mention of God, and of the mutual relation between God and man, as compared with the reticence alike of the Analects, and of Mencius, exponent of Confucius and a contemporary of Chwangtsŭ.

The phrases occasionally present a superficial analogy to some of the most spiritual phrases of S. Paul. Whatever is their intrinsic value, the underlying doctrine exercises no perceptible influence on the current sentiment of the masses, which is Confucianist on its ethical side, Buddhist in what relates to eschatology, and derives from the conglomerate which bears the name of Taoism little beyond a belief in magic and the possibility of communication with the dead, in geomancy, and in the *elixir vitæ* and the philosopher's stone. Philosophical Taoism has interested deeply such thinkers as the Bishop of Durham, and the late Canon Aubrey Moore.‡ The theism of Chwangtsŭ, however, can scarcely be taken as a true analogue of the God of revelation. "God is a principle," we read in one passage (p. 68, Giles); and further on (p. 74), "A man looks upon God as his father, and loves Him in like manner." "Shall we not love that which is *greater than God?*" "Shall he not sacrifice his life for the supreme Ruler of Creation." Upon this last phrase Mr. Giles annotates: "*Scilicet* Tao, the omnipresent, omnipotent principle which *invests even God Himself* with the attributes of divinity." Such a Deity can hardly be thought of as really nearer to revealed truth than the agnosticism of Confucius and his

---

* "Chwangtsŭ," translated from the Chinese by Herbert A. Giles, published by Bernard Quaritch.

† Analects and Mencius in "Sacred Books of the East." Clarendon Press, Oxford.

‡ See his note on the Philosophy of Chwangtsŭ, prefixed to Mr. Giles' edition mentioned above.

school. For both, God is principle,* "that which is not I and makes for righteousness," a conception widely removed from the God of the Pentateuch, the Psalter, the Prophets, and still more widely from the triune God of the New Testament.

(8) The limited time assigned to this paper forbids detail regarding the *idolatrous concomitants* of this triform religious system. Briefly speaking, the prevalent idolatry strictly so called originated with, and is fostered by, Buddhism and Taoism. The first presents as objects of worship a vast array of canonized men, from Gautama Buddha and his original disciples through the ranks of their successors, augmented also by imaginary saints, buddhas or semi-buddhas, down to certain emperors of the reigning dynasty admitted among the *arhan*, "perfected disciples" of the Buddha. To these are presented in convent temples, or household shrines, lights, incense, and flowers; services are intoned to the accompaniment of metallic instruments of music, and vows are made before them in hope of benediction from sickness or calamity. Taoism has borrowed some of these idols, and has added, peculiar to its own system, images of the presiding deities of planets and celestial regions, of rulers of the elements and of diseases, of national heroes, and patrons of literature and the arts. The ritual, if not the formularies, in Taoism is also largely imitated from the Buddhist, wherever that took its origin. And on the whole the two systems present a curious analogy to mediæval Christian ritual and ordinance. Like the mediæval Church, they have communities of celibates who are the officiating ministers of their temples, as well as assistants at private celebrations when invited; like it they wear elaborate and gorgeous vestments, recite services largely in an unknown tongue, which are intoned antiphonally with musical accompaniment; like it they use a rosary, holy water, ceremonial benediction, and a tonsure.

In Confucianism proper there are no images. The ministers of worship are in no sense a clergy. They are the heads of families for the worship of the family or tribe; the literary graduates of the district, prefecture, or province, for the special worship of such administrative areas; and the emperor himself for the whole realm. The objects of worship are wooden tablets bearing the names of departed ancestors, of Confucius and the hierarchy comprising his canonized successors and expositors in several generations, also heaven and earth represented by symbols, the *genius loci*, the grain, and, by a development of later ages, heroes and benefactors of the people. Before these, with regulated distinctions, sacrifices of animal and other food and drink are offered; some, including the offerings to Confucius, being a counterpart of the Latin *suovetaurilia*. The idolatry and the ritual of China are happily free from the cruelty and obscenity which, we are told, disgrace the rites and temples of India.

(9) *High comparative morality.*—Cursory as has been my sketch of Chinese religions and worships, it was meant to lead my hearers to the conclusion that China possesses an advantage over other known systems of pagan worship. The absence of bloody rites, and of vice consecrated by association with popular deities, is an obvious advantage. The principles of Confucianism have tended to raise

* So Chutsŭ, the great Confucianist expositor of the twelfth century.

the moral standard in China, I do not hesitate to say, above the average of non-Christian nations. Idolatry, *ipso facto*, teaches falsehood; and in China, as everywhere else, it has tended, no doubt, to deaden the instinct and neutralize the precepts that make for truthfulness.

To deny the existence of flagrant shortcomings from even the avowed standard would be dishonest and absurd. The still legal practice of judicial torture, the condition of a numerous class of prostitutes, nearly all of them slaves of owners who virtually have power over them of life and death, the known existence among rich and poor of yet more ghastly vices, together with the practice of cramping the feet of female children, in obedience to an ancient fashion, which even the Manchow conqueror of the seventeenth century tried in vain to exterminate, constitute a formidable list of offences against national morality, which violate the spirit, if not the letter, of their own ethics. To these should be added the hitherto incurable habit of pretence, evasion, and downright falsehood, which characterizes the domestic government hardly less than the foreign diplomacy of China. At the present time it is too probable that the population of half China have been led to believe by public proclamation that Japan has been defeated at all points, and that nothing but the lofty lenity of the emperor has refrained from exterminating them. What I would plead in mitigation is simply a comparison, which is proverbially odious, and, of course, of no effect in cancelling a charge of actual immorality. It ought, however, to put a check on the severity of our condemnation, if we conclude, as I cannot but do, that it is vain to search ancient or contemporary history for a non-Christian nation freer from moral blame than China is; further, that but few centuries ago blame of the same kind attached to nearly all, if not all, the Christian states; if, indeed, they are even now quite free from it, or have made anything like adequate progress in morality after centuries of professed Christianity.

I have attempted to sketch, from a moral and religious point of view, the field of missionary duty in China.

(10) *Christian Missions.*—What has the Church done for China since her original commission to "teach the nations and to baptize them?"

(*a*) *Nestorian.*—So far as our documents go, the Nestorians were the first to carry the adorable Name to China.* The first missionary, Olopun, reached Hsi-an Fu in Shensi, then the metropolis of China, in 635 A.D. Welcomed by the reigning emperor, Olopun and his successors, not without vicissitudes, diffused somewhat widely their form of Christianity for two centuries. In 841 an edict, directed against the Buddhists, was made to include the Nestorian missionaries; with the result that thenceforward their work disappears from history. The edict states the number of "western teachers" at 3,000; but this includes *Muhupi*, supposed by some critics to indicate disciples of Manes.

(*b*) *Catholic.*—The next mission was Catholic, and was led by the devoted John à Monte Corvino, sent by Pope Nicholas IV. to Khanbalu, now Peking, about the close of the thirteenth century. In 1307 Clement V. made him bishop, with seven suffragans, Franciscan or Dominican monks, under his jurisdiction. His efforts seemed to have

* See "The Nestorian Monument of Hsi-an Fu," a Lecture by Professor Legge, published by Trübner & Co.

reached chiefly the Mongols, to which race the reigning family belonged. "Nothing permanent," says Dr. Legge, "came of their labours." In 1341 the Mongol dynasty, which seems to have favoured the missionaries, was expelled by a revolution whose leader emerged from a Buddhist monastery. It is possible that animosity against the Mongols involved the Christians to whom they had shown favour.

(*c*) *Roman.*—It was near the close of that century which witnessed the disruption of the Western Church, resulting from the revolt of Christians against the moral corruption and ecclesiastical misrule of her clergy and her popes, that Ruggiero and Ricci led the famous Jesuit mission to China. It was as though the disappointing aspect of things religious at home impelled those high-minded ecclesiastics to seek a field as distant as possible from the seats of religious corruption for the exercise of their ministry and the labour of their lives. Without the initial encouragement that welcomed Olopun, and, perhaps, à Monte Corvino, in the teeth of suspicion and opposition, the great leaders established themselves, first in the Southern Province of Kwang-tung, then in Chianghsi in the heart of China, till, finally, they made their way to Peking, where their science and art opened to them access to the highest personages of the empire. The advantage gained by Ricci under the Chinese dynasty was not forfeited at his death in 1610, nor on the overthrow of that dynasty by the Manchow in 1644. During the whole of that century, with little interruption, the successive missionaries, many of them men of commanding ability, if not many so conspicuous as Ricci, retained a position of singular influence about the court, as the astronomers, geographers, and scientific engineers of the emperor. "Their converts," meanwhile, "were not a few, and amongst those of high rank was a member of the Hanlin," the highest literary college, "Hsü Kwanghsi, who assisted Ricci in translating Euclid into Chinese," and whose influence was effectively exerted till his death in favour of Christianity. His patrimonial estate near Shanghae is still the site of one of the most interesting Jesuit establishments in China. During the three centuries of missionary effort since Ricci's commencement, persecution has been frequent, and sometimes severe. Native converts and European missionaries alike have witnessed their sincerity with their lives. Calamity has sometimes been invited by the unwisdom and mutual dissension of the missionaries themselves. Now the *vexata quæstio* of an adequate Chinese designation for the true God, now that of the nature, religious or civil, of the Confucianist ceremonies, and again some matter of ecclesiastical precedence or of nationality, has drawn the unfriendly attention of the government or the populace and involved the missions in disaster. A conspicuous defect in their *modus operandi*, from the Anglican point of view, is seen in their neglect during the three centuries to provide their converts with a version of Holy Scripture in their own language. This is especially to be deplored when it is recollected that during their enjoyment of imperial protection they had amongst their missionaries admirable European scholars, and the *élite* of the Chinese *literati* among their personal friends. What might not have been achieved if the Jesuit leaders had but sympathized with the devoted Bishop Steere in his opinion that no missionary work can be sound which has not the Bible in the native language at its centre!

The Roman missions are now represented, to the best of my

information, in all the Chinese provinces; and state the number of their converts as 1,200,000, of whom three hundred have been admitted to the priesthood.

(*d*) *Greek Church.*—I have no *data* with regard to the missions of the Greek Church, which are, I believe, almost confined to Peking. They have, at any rate, recently done what the Jesuits neglected to do, by providing their converts with a Chinese version of the New Testament.

(*e*) *Protestant Missions.*—In passing on to Protestant missions—which took their rise full two centuries later than those of Rome—there is no branch of their industry more conspicuous than that devoted to *Biblical translation.* Accomplished as were many of the Romanist leaders, and admirable as is much of their Chinese literary work, the Protestant translators and editors, even in the department of science and mathematics, have left them little superiority; whereas in Bible work they have been the only labourers.

Bible translation is a task which may be essayed with too great haste and eagerness, and by men insufficiently equipped to command success, where success implies various scholarship only not more than religious reverence and theological insight. Some versions have been susperseded, but others bid fair to survive on the score of intrinsic merit of a high order. The honours of the work belong to the Nonconformists, especially to Dr. Morrison and his successors of the London Missionary Society. Dr. Medhurst, who left England for Malacca in 1817, ten years after the arrival of Dr. Morrison at Canton, was evidently a man of singular natural gifts for the task in which he distinguished himself. He had small advantages of education—a mason by trade, who had learnt printing that he might be qualified for missionary employment at Malacca—but his faculty for acquiring languages and knowledge of all kinds seems to have been far above the average. The edition of the Bible in literary Chinese style, which now holds the first place for grace and perspicuity amongst our complete or partial versions of Holy Scripture, was the work of a small committee of missionaries of the London Missionary Society, of which Medhurst was the leading spirit and held the labouring oar. Just now, committees are engaged, at the request of the Bible Societies of Great Britain and America, in revising this and other versions, with a view to attaining unity of rendering of the sacred text in each variety of Chinese style. Whatever is the ultimate success of this difficult experiment, it is permissible to doubt whether Dr. Medhurst's great work will ever be superseded till Chinese Christians are found equipped with adequate western scholarship, linguistic and theological, to undertake a revision of their own. The other versions referred to are in a simpler form of the classical style, and in the Mandarin colloquial, respectively. The character in which all these are written is one and the same; whilst the construction of the classical and of the colloquial styles is perfectly distinct. The latter is a spoken language, current, with modifications, among two-thirds of the population; the former is addressed to the eye, rather than the ear.

With the Mandarin version, completed about twenty-five years ago, will always be connected the name of the very able Dr. Schereschewsky, formerly bishop of the American Church at Shanghai. Our own Bishop Burdon of Hong Kong, Dr. John of the London Missionary Society, and Dr. Blodget of the American Board, have been amongst

the more conspicuous labourers on versions in the simpler literary style.

Biblical translation also occupied the time and labour, amongst Anglicans, of the late Bishop Russell of North China. His task, however, was confined to the local dialect of Ningpo, which he expressed alphabetically in Roman letters. This useful form, especially for the uneducated Christians, has been adopted in some of the missions of the Fuhkien and Canton provinces and elsewhere with good results.

Of missions outside of the Roman Church, the first established in China was that of the London Missionary Society under Dr. Morrison in 1807. American Congregationalists and Baptists followed. The American Episcopal Church and the Church Missionary Society commenced their work, not far apart, after the conclusion of the Treaty of Nankin in 1842. Many other Protestant bodies about that time, and in the succeeding half-century, have added their contingents to the "many hued host," as Dr. Legge has called it, of Protestant missions. Germany, Scandinavia, Canada, and the Australian Colonies are represented as well as Great Britain and America. Happily, sectarian animosity has rarely made its presence felt. Missionaries and the organizations on which they depend have usually addressed themselves, with obvious good sense, to the unevangelized heathen, instead of competing with each other in fields already occupied. There have been exceptions, but, on the whole, the too probable result of such a variety of Churches and sects in juxtaposition has hardly been realized. Mutual regard and—in such works as Biblical translation—co-operation have been found possible between bodies so unlike in Church polity as the Anglican, the Presbyterian, the Congregationalist, and the Wesleyan. The distinct avowal of our own principles, made in charity, has never been found to interfere with such intercourse within its obvious limits.

In 1891 the total number of Protestant missionaries in China was a little short of one thousand, of whom the larger proportion were women. Of the whole, the Church of England claimed sixty-six with three bishops, the American Episcopal Church one bishop and twelve other missionaries, male and female. Since then the total has been considerably raised.

When the difficulties of the Chinese language are borne in mind, it will be obvious that a very large number of missionaries at any given date must be reckoned as non-efficient. A certain number never attain to fluent, idiomatic speech. Very many more never acquire a mastery of the literary language, which, when Chinese composition is included, belongs to very few indeed. There are, however, many, both men and women, who, after a few years' practice, converse freely in Chinese on any subject, and can read and explain the Bible and fulfil the duties of teacher or pastor with nearly as much fluency and effect in China as at home.

Next to Biblical translation and kindred literary work, *education* may be named among the important branches of missionary duty. In our own missions, *e.g.*, at Ningpo and at Fuhchow, this implies a central high school or college, in which, wholly in a Chinese medium, the pupils, children of Christians and a few others, are taught Scriptural knowledge and Church doctrine, besides geography, history, mathematics, and the Chinese classics and composition. The senior class, after

a satisfactory final examination, are appointed masters of day schools in the neighbouring country towns or villages attended by heathen children, as well as members of Christian families within reach. The masters, after giving satisfaction during five years, are admitted to a theological class, for a two years' course of further instruction in Divinity, to qualify them as catechists, or for ordination as pastors in the native Church, or as native missionaries.

Of course the Gospel is *preached orally* to the heathen in mission rooms, or by the way-side, both conversationally and in set addresses; the preachers being usually the catechists, assisted and superintended by the missionary.

Another and, though the last mentioned, perhaps the most important of all our methods of evangelization, is the *medical department*. The Church Missionary Society maintains, aided by special funds, seven or eight hospitals and dispensaries in the provinces of Kwangtung and Fuhkien in the southern diocese, and in three great cities in Chechiang in Mid-China. Last year upwards of 2,000 in-patients and more than 76,000 out-patients were treated at these places. Nothing has done more than this beneficial work to break down prejudice and conciliate the regard and attention of all classes. It has its risks, and there is little doubt that the slanders by which missionaries, Roman and Protestant, have been again and again defamed, have sprung largely from misrepresentations of some surgical operation or anatomical preparation seen on the mission premises. The missionary needs, not only professional skill and piety, but tact too; a combination of courage and caution, of kindliness and good sense, not easily found together, but invaluable when found. The principal mission-hospitals are also medical and surgical schools, which have already produced skilful and efficient Chinese doctors. The Gospel is explained to both in-patients and out-patients, and not a few have been converted and baptized, including several lepers.

The total number of communicants reported by the various Protestant Societies may amount now to, perhaps, 40,000. Professor Legge, of Oxford, can look back to the day when, in 1843, "the converts, then alive, could be counted on the fingers of one hand." On my own arrival in China, in 1858, the Church Missionary Society had upon its books about fifty communicants. It now reports close upon 4,000, representing more than 15,000 Christians and Catechumens. Of these, twenty-four are in Holy Orders, most of them efficient pastors of native flocks, two employed in education, and the rest missionaries.

(11) *Why not greater progress.*—There is surely cause for gratitude to God, if not for surprise, in such results obtained in face of such difficulties, and with so insignificant a force. Drawing to a conclusion, it may be permitted me to make an observation regarding the paucity of the missionary force actually engaged. In doing so, I have in view the Church of England only, and primarily the Church Missionary Society, whose present force of 116 missionaries, senior and junior, are scattered over an enormous area. Figures will not give so true a view of the situation as a statement of another kind. I have indicated four main branches of missionary duty—literary work, preaching, education, and medical charity. Cases occur in which all four have to be devolved on one man's multifold, but of course inadequate,

energies. Such cases, no doubt, are rare. But it is not at all rare to see one clergyman attempting to do justice to tasks which ought to be shared amongst at least four labourers—the pastor, evangelist, educator, and translator—besides sustaining the not insignificant correspondence and the "table-serving" of the mission. This is the result in the first instance, no doubt, of the tardiness with which Churchmen volunteer for the mission field, and especially for China. China, which presents some of the most difficult, but certainly not the least interesting, problems of evangelistic work, is, if I mistake not, one of the least attractive fields to the men who volunteer from the universities or from the ranks of the younger clergy. We who know something of the extent, difficulty, and promise of the task, and of our own insufficiency, would fain see a change in this respect; a fairer proportion of Churchmen, strong in faith and in knowledge, offering their services for China.

But it is possible—I make the suggestion not without diffidence—that the increasing adoption of *sporadic tactics*, so to speak, in the mission field, has something to do with the weakness of our force. Years ago, in the secretariat of Henry Venn, it was an axiom at Salisbury Square that a strong base was indispensable. Stations, it was held, should be equipped with missionaries numerous enough, not merely to attempt the conversion of the population around them, but to train native evangelists, teachers, and clergy, who might go further and work with more directness than the foreigner can hope to do. Except with regard to medical missionaries, we hear little of any such principle now that the total number of volunteers is largely increased. Insignificant forces, sometimes inexperienced units, are pushed forward to such a distance from all support, that mutual counsel of the less experienced with their seniors is impossible. Meantime old stations, with their several departments of service, are left undermanned, and we see the pluralist missionaries of that very undesirable kind to which I have alluded. The work they do, and the results they achieve, are, no doubt, to those who know the conditions matter for surprise and gratitude; but the situation is not fair to them, nor to the common cause.

(12) There is one other topic of interest on which I wish with all humility to offer an observation. It is the proper function of *female missionaries*, as seen in the light of Scripture and Church principles. I have referred above to the proportion of women to men in the aggregate of Protestant missionaries. Women considerably outnumber men in the forces of the Church Missionary Society. All honour to our Christian sisters for their zeal in offering their services, and for the courage, perseverance, and resource they have shown in the face of difficulty and danger. It is known, however, that two at least of the Church societies have for some time recognized the necessity of a fuller organization of this admirable branch of the service, both with regard to the mutual relation of its members, and their due connection with missionary committees in the field. Has it, however, yet been decided what, after all, is the true department of missionary work in which women should find scope for their devotion? To watch the proceedings of some individuals, and one or two missions, one would conclude that they held the doctrine, not of the equality, but of the identity of the sexes, whether with regard to personal risk, the kind of work, or independence of action. Ladies, sometimes a solitary lady, are seen "in

charge," as pioneers, of a station in a city or town. They are associated perhaps, a questionable expedient, with a native catechist; sometimes they are quite without such support. That under such circumstances they conduct themselves with admirable discretion, as well as devotion, we always hope, we are sometimes sure. But as Church folk, guided in the ultimate resort by Holy Scripture, is this "the mind of Christ?" I shall be told, perhaps, that the disparity of the sexes is an antiquated mistake, and that even New Testament cases are altered by nineteenth century circumstances. What cannot be altered is the, not inequality, if you please, but unlikeness of the sexes; from which common sense, I venture to think, would deduce diversity of office in Christ's service. And when I look into the New Testament, surely inspired sanction of such diversity meets me everywhere. I see it in our Lord's commission of His Disciples before and after His Resurrection, in the record of the Acts, and in the prescriptions and allusions of the Epistles. Our Lord's grace to women, and His recognition of the fruits of such grace in their devoted services, are significant enough of the place they held in His estimation, which refuses to be styled inferiority in any invidious sense. Consider His bearing to His Mother, save where duty to His divine Father interfered, or to the holy women to whom He appeared first after the resurrection, and made them His messengers to the Apostles. Consider also the glimpses afforded us of feminine offices in the family of Philip of Cæsarea, in that of Aquila, in the Churches of Cenchreæ and Philippi; or again, the tone of respectful regard with which S. Paul, writing to the Romans, commemorates one woman's name after another. Nevertheless the offices in which they won their honours are feminine all, offices of succour, of ministration, of deaconhood; not an apostolate, a pastorate, or a government. The accomplished Priscilla bears a share in the expository teaching with which Apollos is advanced in the Christian *gnosis;* but she does it at home; "they took him unto them." Philip's daughters "did prophesy;" but if they led the life of public preachers, like their father, the history preserves no hint of it. Custom appears to have permitted Lydia to travel with her household independently, and occupy her own house in foreign parts, for purposes of trade, but there is nothing to suggest that the zeal of her regeneration found vent in itinerant evangelization. The early Church, as is well-known, gladly availed itself of female co-operation, but, to the best of my knowledge, in offices distinctively feminine. Prophetic inspiration seems to have given the subjects of it, male and female, a standing outside of the orders and regular ministries of the Church. Prophetesses excepted, women in the early Church are seen occupied with tasks which could be performed in their own home or their neighbours'; with the tendance of the sick and poor, with domestic teaching, with intercessory prayer. The annals of the Church and the New Testament alike point to such and similar functions, in co-operation with clerical and medical missionaries, in support and development of their initiation, as those in which the admirable delicacy and strength of the intellect and heart of women will find their true scope. On such terms I would fain see the female contingent ever increasing in numbers, provided only that our brethren were moved to offer themselves in something like proportionate numbers.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. F. B. BARING-GOULD, Secretary of the Church Missionary Society.

MY only claim on your generous indulgence arises from the fact that, though not a missionary, I have enjoyed special opportunities of becoming familiar with missionary methods at home, and have had the advantage of seeing those methods being carried out in many parts of the mission-field abroad.

Thank God for the prominent position occupied by the missionary enterprise in the public press, and in our monthly and quarterly magazines, in our Diocesan Conferences, and in our Church Congresses. And yet how many among the members of our beloved Church fail absolutely to grasp the relative proportion which this subject occupies in Holy Scripture. No wonder, therefore, the question is raised, Are we justified in sending missionaries into the interior of China? One thoughtful gentleman the other day—and he is but a sample of hundreds of others—told me that he failed to see why Mohammedanism was not an equally useful religion with Christianity. And a Christian statesman, deservedly held in high esteem, has recently informed the world that "the selection of a single passage (S. Matt. xxviii. 19) from the preaching of the Founder of our faith, as the sanction of a movement against all other faiths, is a dangerous experiment." Shall I not carry with me the sympathy of this audience when, with all solemn earnestness, I say that we, in Church Congress assembled, prefer to accept the statement of the present respected occupant of the See of Durham, when he declares "that the commission which bids us labour in the mission field is a commission to the whole Christian Church as a Church. Missionary work is not a voluntary, supererogatory work of a few or more devoted souls. It is a charge which is given to all as Christians." We prefer to accept the recent statement of a respected China missionary: "Hearty interest in Christian Missions is inseparably bound up with intelligent and sincere faith in Christianity itself." We prefer to accept the implied teaching of the Church of our Fathers, when she bids us pray, "We humbly beseech Thee for all sorts and conditions of men; that Thou wouldst be pleased to make Thy way known unto them, Thy saving health unto all nations"; we prefer to accept the weighty statement of Art. xviii.; we prefer to accept no mere "single passage," but the reiterated injunction of the Divine Word, that the individual Christian is to be the light of the world, the salt of the earth, the witness unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

Here, then, is the fundamental principle on which we feel justified in sending missionaries to the interior of China. We are justified because our Lord and Master bids us go everywhere preaching the Gospel; everywhere, absolutely independent of political considerations, whether the Government of the country approve, permit, or even oppose; everywhere, in spite of personal risks, for so did S. Paul and others of the Apostolic band; everywhere, employing every precaution which prudence and experience dictate, carefully avoiding all needless grounds for offence against native prejudices; everywhere, though under no circumstances ought the missionary to clamour for gunboats: I indignantly deny that the mass of them ever think of so acting; everywhere, while we at home may justly claim that Her Majesty's Government will take such steps as are necessary to induce the Government of the country to act effectively in the interests of order and justice, and to secure the protection pledged by treaty rights (where such exist) for the foreign residents, and liberty of conscience for the Native Christians.

Gladly would I plead for the world—with its one thousand millions who know not Christ—but our subject now is China. China with her two hundred different dialects,

with, according to some computations, one-third the population of the globe, with the splendid staying power of her race. Think of her needs! Visit the Yamens in most of her provinces; see how justice is too often administered; examine into the condition of the toilers of the soil; go into her temples—and then say what is her need! Or to quote the language of a leading article in the *Hong Kong Weekly Press* of August 15th, "If it be admitted that there is anything elevating and ennobling in Christianity, anything to make men's lives purer, to promote justice and mercy, then no country in the world stands more in need of Christianity than China, a country eaten up with greed and selfishness and corruption, and where the people—though I know some take exception to the statement—without provocation can engage in such fiendish work as that of the Ku-cheng massacre." And what is the entire Church of God doing to meet this need? As far as I can learn, all Protestant Christendom has now in China one thousand five hundred missionaries, men and women. And what is the Church of England's share in this work? As far as I can ascertain, she has now two hundred and ten representatives. Verily, instead of laying flattering unction on our souls that we are doing so much, have we not cause to humble ourselves in the dust—as a Church—that we are doing so little?

What, then, is wanted? Will this audience forgive me if I say that what pre-eminently is needed is a spiritual earthquake amongst ourselves to arouse us to a more adequate estimation of our personal responsibility in this matter? But what is needed in China? Emphatically, *men*, full of love to souls and full of the Holy Spirit. But beyond this, what is needed for China? I speak with great diffidence, since my sojourn in that land extended only over a few weeks. But as far as Fuh-Kien is concerned, of two points I am quite clear: (1) If the fanaticism of the great cities is to be broken down, under God, this can best be accomplished by a large augmentation of our medical missionary staff. This is the scientific key to unlock many a city, many a home, and many a heart. Would to God that scores of the flower of our younger medical brethren would consecrate their talents to this truly Christlike work! (2) If the women are to be reached, they can only, at least to a very large extent, be reached by their own sex. Etiquette retains the Chinese lady within the precincts of her home; she only goes forth in her chair, which is closely curtained. Footbinding renders it impossible for her poorer sisters to traverse any great distance in pursuit of Christian teaching, and rules of propriety absolutely debar the male missionary from visiting them in their homes. Hence, as is so generally the case throughout the nations of the East, women can only be reached by women. Would to God that hundreds more of England's daughters may have their hearts drawn forth by the needs, the appalling, urgent needs of their sisters in China! Of course, all Societies recognize the responsibility which rests upon them to carry on their work with prudence and discretion, and to take all steps in their power for the safety of their missionaries, especially of their sisters.

Time fails to speak of the encouragements which God has graciously vouchsafed to the work. I can but thankfully acknowledge the devotion of many of the Native pastors, catechists, schoolmasters, and Bible-women; the reverence which marks not a few of the congregations; the splendid aggressiveness of very many of the Native Christians, young and old, rich and poor; the generosity which prompts large contributions towards the erection of their churches, often out of their deep poverty; and in some instances proving the depth and reality of their faith by undertaking the entire support of their Church organization. Nowhere in the mission-field have I felt that we had more cause than in China to re-echo the words of the great Apostle to the Gentiles: "Thanks be unto God, which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest through us the savour of His knowledge in every place."

With all my heart and soul, then, I plead for China—nay, the blood of the martyrs of Ku-cheng pleads—yes, pleads for a splendid vengeance! "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink; for, in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head." Give them now, give them promptly, give them liberally of the bread and of the water of Life! I plead not for any Society; but I do plead for those for whom Christ died; I do plead with those on whom Christ has a definite, personal claim with respect to these people. I plead, not for money, but for prayer. Shall we not as a Congress pray for the very murderers: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do"? I plead for increased self-consecration. Are there none even in this gathering who will be—if the interpretation be allowed—"baptized for the dead"? After weeks of earnest thought and prayer, may some be led to offer themselves for service to that Society which they deem best, and thus respond to the cry for vengeance which, as I have said, goes up to Heaven from the land watered with the blood of the martyrs, and which is re-echoed by the very God of Heaven. "Whom shall I send, and who will go for Us?"

AGRICULTURAL HALL.

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD in the Chair.

NATIONAL EDUCATION

IN ENGLAND, AS COMPARED WITH (1) THE COLONIES, (2) THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE; REGARD BEING HAD IN EACH CASE TO THE PLACE OCCUPIED BY RELIGION.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D., D.C.L., Rector of S. James', Piccadilly; and Canon of Windsor.

THE subject assigned to me to-night—"National Education in England as compared with the Colonies"—is certainly formidable in its largeness and complexity. But for fear of disrespect, I should be actually tempted to suppose that even the Subjects Committee have some share in the common English ignorance of the extent and variety of conditions of our world-wide Colonial Empire; and fancy that, on this point as on others, there is some one general Colonial policy which can be briefly sketched out in a Congress paper, and compared easily with our own. I must, therefore, protect myself and my audience, by venturing to limit the subject in several ways in order to bring it within practicable range.

There are, I observe from the Colonial Office List, "forty-two distinct and independent Colonial Governments," besides various Protectorates. I propose to take into consideration only certain characteristic specimens from the four chief Colonial groups—from North America, Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba; from Australasia, New South Wales, Victoria,

Queensland, and New Zealand; from South Africa, Cape Colony and Natal; from the West Indies, Jamaica and Barbados.

Again, in respect of National Education, I shall limit myself almost entirely to the Elementary form, in which it affects the great body of the people. Even in this aspect I must be content to dwell mainly on the relation to the religious element in education, which is not only the burning question of the moment, but is probably that which gives the subject its place in the programme of the Church Congress.

I.—If we are to make any intelligent survey of the subject under these limitations, it is well to fix in our minds the actual conditions of the problem, as it presents itself everywhere to those who are charged with the destinies of each political community of our English race.

There are certain points practically beyond the reach of any serious controversy. Thus there is, first, a universal conviction that the education of its citizens is a matter of the highest national interest, and, therefore, an imperative national duty. Hence, as far as possible under the material conditions, primary education is compulsory and generally free. I may add that the chief Colonial Governments are inclined to extend their action, through advanced schools and colleges, so as to provide out of public funds for the higher grades of education, which we mainly leave to other agencies. Accordingly they venture on demands from the revenue, which, in proportion, far transcends our own, but which hitherto have been, on the whole, cheerfully met, and supported by public opinion.

There is, next, a universal advance towards a large and sound view of what true education is—a conviction that in it provision must somehow be made for the physical, the intellectual, the moral, and even the spiritual capacities and needs of the child s nature. Experience has taught men that on the development of these, in something like true harmony, depends the right discharge of the duties of citizenship, and therefore the welfare of the civil community.

Lastly, there is in various degrees everywhere a sense—which may be only a passive acknowledgment, or may be an energetic belief—that, since religion concerns itself with the relation to the supreme power, in which both the individual and the community "live and move and have their being," it is impossible to ignore religion in the education, which is to teach each soul its right relation even to itself and to its fellow-men. I remember in 1870 an utterance of Professor Huxley, declaring that in his opinion education without religion—that is, as he explained it, without something infinitely to reverence and trust—was a thing impossible. And by religion, however other religions may be considered and respected, of course for the people as such, is practically meant the Christianity, which has been for centuries the inheritance and the moulding influence of our English development.

But here this all but universal concensus of opinion ends. There present themselves two crucial and most difficult questions, which, it should be remembered, are in themselves distinct, although in practice they are closely connected with each other.

The first is a form of the great social question, which in these days presents itself in various aspects. It is this—How far shall the State itself assume the function of education, and how far shall it give scope to the voluntary principle—the liberty, first of the parent, and then of

those individuals or associations who are willing to help and direct the parent—contenting itself with that with which it cannot dispense, the function of inspection, encouragement, and control?

The next is the far more formidable difficulty, for which not the State, but the Church of Christ and its members are responsible—created by the unhappy division, apt to degenerate into antagonism, of the various religious Communions, into which our English Christianity is splintered up, and which are in practice too much inclined to lay stress on the points on which they differ, rather than those on which they agree. How shall the State, which, especially in the Colonies, where there is little or nothing of what we call Church Establishment, is bound to an absolutely impartial treatment of all sections of its subjects, great or small, deal with this infinite complication, this most perplexing difficulty?

It is, I suppose, the object of the proposal of this subject to see whether Colonial experience can throw any light upon the solution of these two questions, which are so urgently pressed upon us in England.

II.—In regard to the first, we know that in England Elementary education has passed through three stages. First, it was left wholly to voluntary agencies—practically of the Church, and in less degree of the various Nonconforming Communions. Next, only within the memories of older men, has the State undertaken, in constantly increasing completeness, to test, to encourage, and to aid by grants the education so given. Lastly, just twenty-five years ago—finding, as we must all allow, that, especially in the great towns, this agency was plainly insufficient for its gigantic task—the law of 1870, still professing to recognize and aid all Voluntary schools, made provision through the various municipalities "to supplement" (as it was said) and "not to supersede" the system, which had done and is still doing such noble work.

At this moment, speaking broadly, the educational work of the country is divided almost equally as to population between the two systems, with a slight ascendency still to the older agency. The State professes to deal impartially with both. But under this profession, no doubt a perfectly sincere one, of impartiality, there is, as we are all feeling more keenly every day, this manifest inequality, that the supporters of the Voluntary schools are doubly taxed, by the compulsory rate for the schools of the State, by the voluntary, and yet necessary, rate of contribution to their own school system. The inequality has hitherto been manfully and even nobly borne. But at this moment we are beginning to demand, surely by a not inequitable demand, that it should be in some way greatly mitigated, if it cannot be altogether removed.

Now on this point there is a very remarkable variety of treatment in our various Colonies.

In Jamaica, up to this time, the system formerly prevailing in England is still preserved. So far as I can discover, the voluntary system still holds its ground, under State inspection and encouragement, and, till 1892, even without a Regulatory Act by the Legislative Council. It has about one hundred thousand children at this time in the schools, and a grant of about £40,000 a year.

In Barbados there is a curiously mixed arrangement, which in some points has a special interest to us at this moment. The school buildings

are erected and maintained by the vestries out of rates, and the general expenditure comes from Government funds. The Official Board of Education lays down general regulations, and fixes the remuneration of teachers, while the local school committees (of whom the Minister of the district is always one) appoint the teachers, and dismiss them under appeal to the Board.

In the South African Colonies—Cape Colony and Natal—something like our own present system appears to prevail, and the Government schools and Voluntary schools exist side by side.

In the great Australasian Colonies, speaking generally, the Government, in this matter as in some others, assumes the whole work. It undertakes to cover the vast area of the country with schools—mostly efficient, and often in the thinly-peopled districts very costly, schools—maintained out of public funds. The only variety is in the degree of centralization, or of localization through district boards, of maintenance and authority. Voluntary schools exist, some belonging to our own Church, but most to the Roman Catholic Church, and are so far recognized that they may be held to give "efficient instruction," although by a strange inconsistency they are not in most cases inspected or examined by Government. But they receive no aid, and have to struggle as best they may against the well-endowed and well-officered public schools.

In Canada alone has any attempt been made to treat all classes of schools with absolute impartiality, by allowing under regulation the establishment on religious grounds of "Dissentient" Voluntary schools, and permitting their supporters to allocate their school rates to them. This arrangement is mainly due to the division of population, roughly classified as "Roman Catholic" and "Protestant"—a division represented on the Supreme Board of Education—and to the position of authority and privilege guaranteed by law to the Roman Catholic Church. Accordingly it seems to be thoroughly maintained now only in the Province of Quebec, which out of a population of nearly 1,500,000 has about 1,300,000 Roman Catholics, and about 1,200,000 French speaking. In the other provinces it has to a great extent given way—with vehement controversy at this moment in Manitoba—and will probably give way altogether, to something like the Australasian system.

So far, then, as a general conclusion can be drawn in face of this remarkable variety of system, I cannot but think that the present tendency, especially in the large self-governing Colonies, is towards an almost entirely Governmental organization. To this, I trust that we at home shall never come, merging free voluntary energy in a bureaucratic system. From a variety of causes, material and social—and, I must add, from weariness of sectarian division and jealousy of ecclesiastical influence—the Colonial Governments approach far more to what is roughly called State Socialism than is the case at home. If a reaction against this sets in, it will be partly from the pressure of the enormous financial burden, and partly from dissatisfaction with tendencies to a virtual secularism. But, as yet, such reaction, although it exists and perhaps grows, is far from being prevalent.

III.—It becomes, therefore, a matter of transcendent interest to examine what is the policy adopted by the civil authority in regard to religious education in our various Colonies.

The two extremes are here represented by the West Indian Colonies and the province of Quebec, in which the system appears to be what we call "denominational" with a "Conscience Clause," and the Australasian Colonies of Victoria, Queensland, New Zealand, and virtually (except that the reading of the Bible is not excluded) South Australia, which have adopted a purely secular system. They do not, indeed, desire that religion should be altogether ignored. There is, in most cases, admission (at the discretion of the governing body of the schools) of authorized teachers of various denominations, to give instruction, out of school hours, to those children whose parents desire them to attend. But the provision is, I need not say, wretchedly inadequate in theory, and, I believe, but slightly effective in practice. In any case it cannot touch the general tone and character of the schools and their teachers.

What is the disastrous effect on Colonial society of this secular system, which, so far as it ignores God, is negatively atheistic, and if it places other influences in the supreme place of religion, becomes virtually an idolatry, has been shown with characteristic force and directness by my friend the Bishop of Manchester.

But if a purely denominational system becomes practically impossible, and a purely secular system nationally disastrous, what must the Government of a country do, in its own schools, and in its relation to other schools?

In its own schools, if religious education is in the hands of teachers who are public servants of the whole community, it must be, I suppose, what is called "undenominational." Now no one who knows anything of Christian history needs to be told that an undenominational Christianity—that is, a Christianity unconnected with a religious Communion having a definite creed and a real corporate life—is not the Christianity of the New Testament, and is not the Christianity which has conquered the world. It follows, of course, that (even under our unhappy divisions) denominational schools must be the true strongholds of religious education; that nothing can compensate for their abandonment; and that a Government, which desires the religious education of the people, stultifies itself if it does not give them all possible freedom and encouragement.

But it is of great consequence to understand clearly what is meant by this "undenominational" religious teaching. If it means a teaching from which everything is to be excluded, to which any denomination, however extreme and however insignificant, would object, it is, of course, easy to see that it must become vague, illusory, and all but valueless. But if it means—and historically it is certain that in England and elsewhere it was intended to mean*—that no State schools shall be attached to any one denomination and allowed to teach its distinctive formularies, and that with Holy Scripture as their text-book, all teachers shall be allowed freely to teach what they believe to be its true and full meaning—those teachers, be it remembered, having been

* It cannot be too often remembered that the Cowper-Temple Clause itself, which was not in Mr. Forster's original Bill, was introduced as an alternative to a proposal to lay it down, vaguely and generally, that all education in the Board Schools should be "undenominational." Its author expressly declared that it was intended to avoid "ticketing the schools," as attached to this or that denomination, and that it was not intended to exclude the teaching of the Apostles' Creed.

in almost all cases trained in Christian Institutions—then it follows that by a "Natural" (if we do not say "Supernatural") "Selection," this teaching in our schools will be what the great mass of professing Christians believe; and no one can doubt that on the three great fundamental articles of the Apostles' Creed, the belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that great mass is practically at one. Exceptions there will be—painful exceptions—but this will unquestionably be the rule. I, for one, cannot despise or underrate this kind of undenominational teaching, although I know it to be defective and to need to be supplemented by other agencies. I earnestly trust that the Church and the clergy will strain every nerve to maintain it in its true meaning in the schools of the State.

Now, so far as I can gather, the two great South African Colonies, and in some degree the Canadian Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, here follow the course which has prevailed at home. In the Natal rule I distinctly trace the influence of the well known formula of the London School Board. But far the most remarkable provision is that of the Public School Act of 1880 in New South Wales. In all schools, it expressly lays it down, that while "the teaching is to be non-sectarian," yet that "secular instruction"—by which must be meant instruction for the *seculum* of this life, in which the nation, as such, is especially interested—"is to include general religious teaching." It adds, indeed, in a phraseology, unsound and liable to abuse, "as distinguished from dogmatical and polemical theology." But there is no doubt that its framers contemplated such undenominational teaching as may be given in our Board Schools, and did not (as in our Act of 1870) leave it to the local option of the Boards, whether they would adopt it. Nor is there any doubt that this would have been so carried out as to give much substantial religious teaching, had not the strong Roman Catholic section, contrary to all expectation, made on this matter common cause with the weak secularist party, and done their best to make this provision ineffective. *

But the Act is not content without enlisting in the service of the schools the denominational energy also. After providing for the "secular instruction," as above defined, it goes on to enact, that of the regular school hours, a "portion not exceeding one hour daily shall be set apart, when the children of any religious persuasion may be instructed by a clergyman or other authorized religious teacher, such instruction to be the religious instruction authorized by his Church." This remarkable provision is no dead letter. By our own Church—in my experience, I regret to say, almost alone—it was so taken advantage of, that in the diocese of Sydney we had many thousands of children under instruction. Some seventy-five per cent. of our hard-worked clergy undertook the duty themselves, and were aided by paid lay-readers, under the authority of the Bishop and a committee of Synod. Our teachers, under due regulation, had as much right in the schools as the State teachers themselves; and were, I may add, mostly welcomed by them, on the instructive ground that their work aided the right tone and

* It was hoped to conciliate the Roman Catholic Church by the use in the schools of the old "Irish Lesson Books," agreed upon in Ireland by Archbishop Whately and Archbishop Murray. But this hope proved futile.

discipline of the school. The whole experience was a remarkable one, bearing, as will at once be seen, on some legislative proposals which have already been made here, and on some contingencies which may present themselves in the future. The provisions of the Act are in my mind far from compensating for the non-recognition of Voluntary denominational schools; but they represent the most complete attempt that I know of to secure substantial religious education under a purely State system.

IV.—From this brief survey of these various forms of experiment as to systems of National Education in our chief Colonies, I come back myself to the conclusion that our own system—if it be honestly worked out in the spirit of Mr. Forster's original Bill of 1870, which was far fairer and far more statesmanlike than the Act as finally passed—is under all our circumstances the best practicable system for us. The policy of the Church, as the great representative of the voluntary and religious cause in education, appears to me to be clear in general principle, although there are questions of practical detail, which require the most careful consideration.

It is, on the one hand, to recognize the State-school system, as not only an inevitable, but under our unhappy religious divisions, a natural and equitable, element of National Education; to do all that can be done—and on this very much depends on the clergy, especially in the rural districts—to make its general education thoroughly efficient, and for this end neither to pamper nor to starve its organization; above all, to see that under it the religious element in its education, both in teaching and in tone, shall have the fullest and freest development possible under the law.

But this is, so to speak, only to use the left hand in the educational battle. The strong right hand is our own system of Church schools and colleges. We are, I hope, ready to make for them all needful sacrifice of labour and of wealth. But we insist that by the State they shall be not grudgingly tolerated, but freely and graciously recognized, and enabled to hold their own without an unjust and ruinous rivalry. The time is happily one in which the justice of this claim and the national value of the voluntary principle are more than ever acknowledged, both by authority and by public opinion. Only we must close our ranks; there must be, although it may not be easy to secure it, substantial agreement among all those who fight on our side. Then, I believe, the battle will be won; and that here, as in some other things, we shall be able to show the New Englands of our Colonial Empire, which have tried so many experiments of their own, that there is some wisdom and strength still in the Old England at home, and in her not unsuccessful attempt to blend the old and the new, to harmonize the action of the State with the freer and more elastic energy of the voluntary principle, and to give scope in religious education, both to the undenominational system, and to that denominational teaching, of which the Church, if she is true to her ancient traditions, must be the unwearied champion.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

I HAVE to make an apology. Mr. Athelstan Riley is unable to be present himself to-day, in consequence of having been summoned to attend an important educational meeting under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, but he has sent his paper, and it will be read by the Rev. F. J. Chandler.

---

(2) THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE.

ATHELSTAN RILEY, Esq., M.L.S.B., London.

[*Read by Rev. F. J. Chandler.*]

THE subject entrusted to me is one to which it is impossible to do even the scantiest justice on an occasion like the present. Those who attended the Church Congress at Folkestone in 1892, will remember the valuable papers of the Bishop of Manchester and the Rev. T. Howard Gill, in which they dealt with the systems of Education in Victoria and France respectively. No doubt they felt that the time at their disposal was all too short; and I may well claim your sympathy in having to conduct the Congress over the whole of Europe, to discuss the system of religious instruction in each country, and to point the moral of my tale, all within the compass of twenty fleeting minutes The subject is indeed a mine of wealth to English educationists, and a mine hitherto neglected. My task this evening is but to indicate where they may dig with the best prospect of useful results.

It cannot be too often stated that the conflict which is going on in so many countries, including our own, is a conflict between two views of education which are fundamentally opposed because they are based on different conceptions of human nature. The one regards education as concerned with only the intellectual and physicai development of the child as an earthly citizen; the other looks upon education as a *chose spirituelle*—to quote an old English document—as a system of development which must be based on religion, and permeated with its influence, not only for the production of those moral excellencies which make the good citizen of London or of Norwich, but for the nurture of the heirs of immortality. The Christian man can best discharge the duties of his earthly citizenship, nay, can only adequately discharge them, by the constant remembrance that here he has no continuing city, but he seeks one to come.

If it be said this may be very true, but we are dealing with State education, and the State has no concern with these matters, we can only reply that in that case the State must not meddle with education, and that whilst to tax large bodies of religious men for education which they conscientiously reject is an attack upon their civil freedom; to force it directly or indirectly upon their children is an outrage upon their consciences. But thus contending for our civil and religious liberty as we have the right to do, we must never forget to treat our opponents with justice. Many States have ceased to be Christian in the sense of publicly acknowledging the Faith of Christ; large bodies of men within them have unhappily lost all religious belief, or are hopelessly divided as to the nature of true belief. To treat all parties with fairness, and to devise a scheme of education which shall work with the *minimum* of

injustice, is the problem to which the statesmen of every country should address themselves.

In certain countries the problem is comparatively simple, in others it is complex, as in our own. For the purpose of our inquiry we will divide the States of Europe into three groups. The first, *those States which have strong national faiths without any considerable admixture of dissent or secularism.* Under this heading we may place Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Russia.

The systems of education in the three Scandinavian countries are very similar; we will take that of Denmark as the type. Here religious instruction is compulsory in all elementary schools, and follows the Lutheran confession of faith, the Lutheran catechism being in use. It is given, in village schools at least, by the ordinary teachers, who must have passed the examination at one of the State training colleges, where religious instruction forms part of the curriculum.* I have not found anything of the nature of a conscience clause, but the head master can dispense Jews from attendance at the lessons in religion. Confirmation candidates are always granted leave of absence, if necessary, during school hours, for their preparation, which in Denmark extends over a period of six months. There are very few voluntary schools, and these chiefly Roman Catholic schools, in Copenhagen; they receive no subsidies from the State.

There does not seem much for Churchmen to learn from Scandinavia, but those English Protestants who start at creeds and catechisms, and think dogmas unsuited to the youthful mind, might do worse than study the scholastic systems of the spiritual children of Luther.

In Russia education is in its infancy. Before the reign of Alexander II. there was practically none; it is not yet either compulsory or universal. That Emperor established schools of the *Zemstvo* (district council) shortly after the emancipation of the serfs. These schools are supported by local taxation, and are entirely secular, except in a few cases where the *Zemstvo* calls in the parish priest. The effect of this system was that in all the little country towns there were secular schools, whilst in the villages there were no schools at all. In 1884 associations of private individuals began to found Church schools to be under the control of the diocesans and the Holy Synod; and being encouraged by the powerful minister, M. Pobedonostzeff, these schools increased so rapidly that at the death of Alexander III. no less than 11,000 parishes out of the 38,000 in Russia were provided with them.† Up to the present year these voluntary schools had only received a small grant of 100,000 roubles from the State, but last summer the Council of Ministers resolved to set aside a sum of 3,250,000 roubles annually for the development and maintenance of the Church schools. There can be little doubt that this indicates the intention of the Russian Government to supplant the urban education of the *Zemstvo* secular schools by a national system of religious education on exclusively Church lines; a system easy of application, because no Church in

---

* In Secondary Schools religious instruction is given by a "candidate in theology," *i.e.*, a student who has passed his examination for the Lutheran ministry.

† My friend, Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, to whom I take this opportunity of acknowledging my obligations, writes to me, "Many [of these Church schools] which I have seen are *most excellent* in every way."

Christendom is so closely linked with the State, and so deeply rooted in the hearts of the people, as the Church of Russia. A Russian of high position was explaining to a traveller the reason for the new educational policy of his country. "There are two words in our language," he said, "for education. The first is *obrazovanïe*, which means, *the fashioning after an example*—and our Emperor knows that for us there is but One, Who said, 'I have given you an example.' And the second word is *prosvjeshchenïe*, which signifies *enlightening*—and for us there is but one Light, 'Which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.'" Russia has many difficult problems before her, though very different problems from those which confront England. If the present quickening of her religious life, so remarkable to the careful student of her institutions, is not arrested, and if her statesmen approach these problems in the spirit of this tale, we may well hope that she will not miss their final solution.*

The second group of Continental States presents a different aspect. In these we notice *a sharp division between two parties, the supporters of religious education*, who are almost entirely Catholics, *and the supporters of secular education*, who are the legitimate offspring of the French Revolution. These are France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Austria, and Belgium.

Upon France we need not dwell at any length. Mr. Howard Gill's paper is well known to all students of foreign education.† It is sufficient to state that in the course of a bitter struggle, commencing shortly after the fall of the Second Empire, Republican France has for the present banished all reference to God and religion from her State schools. The only recognition of the consciences of religious parents is to be found in the provision which sets aside Thursday, or, in some cases Tuesday, as a holiday, in order that they may send their children to the priest or minister outside the precincts of the school.

In the elementary schools of Italy all parents who wish for religious instruction for their children have the right to have the principles of the Catholic Faith taught them. The teacher is usually a clergyman, who comes into the school for this purpose. Besides these State schools, administered by the local councils (*consigli communali*), there are many Voluntary schools, maintained by the parochial clergy or religious bodies, which are very largely attended by the children of parents who wish for a more extensive religious education, or, rather, one given in a more religious atmosphere than is possible in the Communal schools. These Voluntary schools are not assisted in any way by the State.

In Spain the public elementary schools are under the control of the municipalities. In all these schools Christian doctrines, *i.e.*, the first principles of the Catholic religion, are taught by the ordinary teachers of the school, or in some cases by the clergy. There is no legal conscience clause, though in practice I understand that it would not be difficult for

---

* It should be noted that I have not included the Grand Duchy of Finland in my remarks on Russia, a country which ethnographically and confessionally belongs to the Scandinavian group, and is governed by its own laws. Also, that what I have said about the love of the Russians for their Church is not, of course, applicable to the Polish or German subjects of the Empire. All political questions, including education, suffer in Poland and the Baltic provinces from racial jealousies. It would be foreign to the purpose of this paper to attack or defend the policy Russia adopts in these portions of her empire.

† Published by the National Society, price fourpence.

a parent to quietly and privately withdraw his child from the religious instruction. Voluntary schools exist, very few Protestant, but a large number of Catholic. They receive no aid from the State. The tendency of Spanish educational legislation appears to be in the direction of strengthening the religious side of the State system.*

Religious instruction is given in the Portuguese public elementary schools generally by the clergy, sometimes by the ordinary teacher of the school. It consists of the doctrines of the Catholic faith as contained in the Catechism. It is not absolutely compulsory. There are, besides the State system, numerous Voluntary schools which receive no grants from the Government. It does not appear that there has been any important changes for many years in the law dealing with the subject of religious instruction in the State schools.

In Austria the religious instruction in the State schools is in the hands of the Catholic clergy. The parish priest, or his curate, must give it, and the school-house is placed at his disposal. The headmaster plans his time-table to suit the convenience of the clergy. Since 1883, the headmaster of an elementary school must be of the same religion as the majority of his scholars. This does not apply to assistant teachers. The teacher has to pass an examination in the religious faith of the church or sect to which he belongs, although, in practice, a teacher only gives religious instruction in the event of a dearth of clergy. There is a conscience clause for Protestants and Jews, and it does not appear that the tenets of their faiths are in any circumstances taught in the State schools; they are, of course, small minorities. The regulations as to free-thinkers are in a somewhat transitional state; if they have no school of their own where moral instruction is given, they must send their children to the Catholic instruction. Voluntary schools have been established in many cases by Protestants and Jews to meet their local needs; they receive some municipal or provincial aid according to the results of inspection. At the present time there is much controversy over education in Austria, and fresh legislation is probable.†

Let us now turn to Belgium. The history of education in that country is so interesting, and the conflict at the present time so acute, by reason of the equality of strength between the contending parties, that I think we cannot do better than take it as a typical history of the struggle which is being waged between Churchmen and Secularists in this educational group of Continental States.

There are four chapters in the history of Belgian education.

The first 1842-1879.—In 1842 a complete scheme of elementary education was established That scheme was deliberately re-actionary; it was not, as we shall see, necessarily bad. Re-action is as important to society as action. Our race progresses sometimes by going forwards and sometimes by going backwards, when we happen to have forgotten or done violence to the laws of our being. Solomon tells us that "there is nothing new under the sun"; which I take to mean, that God being

---

* Thus, in the higher grade schools (*institutos*), the law repealed in 1868 has been revived this year, *i.e.*, that more advanced instruction in Christian doctrine should be obligatory, and that students should pass an examination therein before proceeding to the universities.

† This account of education in Austria does not apply to Hungary, Bosnia, and Herzegovina.

what He is from all eternity, and man and his environment what He made them, the true principles which should govern man's action in the world must remain true so long as man and the world continue to exist. As it is quite certain that man did not make his species, and as it is equally certain that he cannot unmake and re-arrange it, so it is clear that, though he may transgress, he cannot alter the true principles of education by which the development of the individuals of his species is to be conducted. Let us never be afraid of being called re-actionary in our educational policy; re-action may be an imperious necessity. The measure of 1842 was adopted "as a breach from the political doctrines of the eighteenth century, which had sought to make education entirely secular, and to establish society on a purely rationalistic basis."* By this law, which was carried almost unanimously, the responsibility of providing primary instruction devolved upon the Commune. Religious instruction was obligatory, subject to a conscience clause, under the direction of the minister of the faith of the majority of scholars in each school; the ecclesiastical authorities, who were represented at the central office, had the supervision and inspection of the religious teaching, not only in the schools, but in the training colleges established by this law, to each of which a clergyman was attached. That this system should have worked without friction for thirty-seven years is a testimony to its worth. It was indeed admirably suited to a country in which there were practically only two classes to consider, the Church-people and the Secularists. Dissent hardly existed,† and I have no evidence that instruction in any other faith than that of the Church of the country was given in the schools. The Secularist party was, however, steadily growing, and in 1879 this system of national education was overthrown.

The second chapter, 1879-1884.—According to the Secularist party, the existing system of education "violated the spirit of the Belgian constitution." Their two fundamental principles were as follows:—

(1) "The State and the Churches pursue different ends; the action of Church and State developes itself in spheres sharply distinguished from one another."

(2) "Public education ought to be under the superintendence of the State alone."

"Therefore religious instruction, from which the State should stand aside, because it is not competent to provide it, cannot be given a place in the school curriculum."‡

A syllogism with which we are not unfamiliar in England.

The application of these principles resulted in the law of 1879. Religious instruction was removed from the curriculum of the schools, instruction in morality taking its place. Facilities, however, were given to the clergy to impart religious instruction to children of their own confession, before or after school hours, and though the regular teachers might not be delegated by the clergy to perform this duty, they were allowed to hear the repetitions dealing with religion which the children might be set to learn by their spiritual pastors. At the same time

---

* Speech of M. Nothomb in 1842, printed in preamble to Bill of 1895. p. 4.

† In 1846 there were only 6,578 Protestants and 1,336 Jews in the whole country.

‡ Loi sur l' instruction primaire, July 1st, 1895, exposé des motifs.

State recognition was withdrawn from the private (denominational) training colleges, while the State training colleges were secularized.

The immediate result of this measure, which only passed by one vote, was the establishment of a vast number of private elementary schools. By December, 1880, they existed in 1,936 Communes, and contained no less than 455,179 children.* Fifteen hundred male and female teachers resigned their posts in the Communal schools and took office in the Church schools.

Third chapter, 1884-1895.—The energetic action of the denominational party soon met with its reward. A so-called clerical majority was returned at the Elections, and in 1884 another system of elementary education became law.

The following were its chief provisions :—

(1) Communes were not compelled to introduce religious instruction into the Communal schools, but they had liberty so to do, provided that the religious instruction was given at the beginning or end of the class-work, and that there should be a conscience clause.

(2) The Commune might "adopt" and carry on the private, or Church, schools.

(3) No Commune was compelled to establish or maintain a Communal school on other than confessional or denominational lines, unless twenty parents desired a school of the normal communal type.

(4) Should twenty parents in any Commune withdraw their children from the religious instruction given in the Communal school, the Commune was compelled either to provide the denominational instruction required by the parents, or permit it to be given by the clergy or their representatives. In case of refusal, the Government itself might "adopt" and maintain a private school for the needs of those parents.

(5) Certain grants were to be given to efficient non-adopted private schools.

(6) Recognition was restored to the private training colleges.

It will be noted that the difference between the law of 1842 and that of 1884 was this. The law of 1842 established universal Communal schools of a religious and practically Church type, under Church as well as State inspection. The law of 1879 having disestablished religion in the Communal schools, the law of 1884 gave the Communes the option, not only of running their schools on Church lines, but of adopting and maintaining the Church schools within their districts, and subsidized those which were not adopted by the Communes.

The impetus given to religious education by this law will be readily comprehended from the following figures. On December 31st, 1893, there were 4,042 Communal schools which included religious teaching in the curriculum; 1,583 private or Church schools adopted; 153 Communal schools, which remained purely secular. Total, 5,778 public elementary schools. This does not include the non-adopted private schools.

Fourth chapter, 1895.—So strong a wave of public opinion could not expend itself without a further development of religious education. The present Ministry drew up a Bill in July of this year, which provided :

---

* In March, 1883, there were 3,905 Church schools with 622,437 scholars. From December, 1878, to January, 1884, the scholars in the Communal schools fell from 510,588 to 324,656.

(1) Religious instruction to be given in *all* public elementary schools, either in the first or last half-hour of the morning or afternoon session of each day, subject to a conscience clause.

(2) This religious instruction to be given by the parish priest, or under his direction by a teacher of the school, the teacher being left free to accept or decline the task.

(3) Religious inspection by the ecclesiastical authorities, who are to report to the Government.

(4) A clergyman re-attached to all training colleges.

(5) Annual grants to be divided between *all* schools—communal, adopted, and private, on condition of submitting to inspection and certain general rules, private schools remaining free from any local control.*

This new scheme passed the Chamber of Representatives on August 16th by eighty-one votes to fifty-two,† and the Senate a few weeks after by a slightly larger majority.

That the educational contest in Belgium is now ended, it would be idle to hope. The pendulum has swung too far, and the criticism of the Centre, or moderate Catholic party, is probably justified, that the new law takes insufficient account of the profound difference of opinion amongst the people, and does not adequately consider the rights of parents.

We come now to the third and last group, *i.e., those States where, besides the division between the supporters of religious and secular education, religious men are themselves divided by differences of belief.* They are, shortly, the countries of mixed faiths. Here the educational problem is more complex, and more closely resembles that which confronts us in England. I place in this list, Germany, Switzerland, and Holland.

In Germany, whilst there is no Imperial system of education, there is a fundamental principle recognized by the different States, which may be best given in the words of Sec. 24 of the Prussian Constitution of 1850. "In the establishment of public elementary schools, every possible regard must be paid to religious circumstances." In fact the German system is an absolute contradiction of our present English system, which seeks to conduct our national education with the least possible regard for religious circumstances. Our educational opponents are fond of holding up the Germans as the example of a well-educated people; it is well to remind them that this educational efficiency has been attained by a strictly denominational system. In all German States religious instruction, according to the different religious denominations and sects, is practically compulsory, and is given under the control of the different religious bodies. To take Prussia, which for all practical purposes of school affairs may be considered as identical with Germany, in the mixed schools *(Simulstan schule)*, whilst some of the teachers are appointed without reference to their creed, a sufficient number of Roman Catholic

---

* The basis on which this grant will be calculated is the number of distinct classes in the school, the minimum of each class being fixed by Government.

† I have not dealt with the purely secular aspects of the new Bill. The position of the teachers, which had been seriously affected through the working of the 1884 law, is improved in the direction of greater fixity of tenure and increased salaries.

and Protestant teachers are engaged in accordance with the proportion of the children.*

During the three last school years (age from eleven to fourteen) for the Protestants, and the five last school years (age from nine to fourteen) for the Roman Catholics, when the children are being prepared for confirmation, the religious instruction is sometimes given by the parochial clergy. As a rule, about four hours a week are devoted to religious instruction, of which two are devoted to the Catechism, and two to Bible history; occasionally a fifth hour on Saturday is devoted to the Gospel and Epistle of the following Sunday. Besides these mixed schools there are strictly denominational schools. A town council generally finds itself obliged to establish a separate school for about sixty or seventy children of one denomination.† If the local authorities are slack, the Government occasionally interferes in favour of a minority. It appears that the present feeling is strongly in favour of denominational rather than mixed schools. Both are maintained out of what we should call rates. In the case of small religious communities, such as the Baptist or Methodist, the members of the denomination have to find their own instructors, who are generally ministers, but it appears that, as a rule, all the Protestant sects are content with the general Protestant instruction until the children are about eleven years of age, when they are handed over to their own ministers. The way in which the law works is as follows:—Whenever a minority of parents find their children in a school where the religious instruction does not satisfy their consciences, they first try to make the authorities appoint a special religious instructor. If the number of children increases, the next step is to get a separate school. There are very few Voluntary schools; these receive no grant from the State. That this system satisfies the people of Germany there can be no doubt; that it works well in the interest of both education and religion is evident, for, on the one hand, Germany has long been the pattern for educational reformers, and, on the other, no one who visits the country can fail to be struck with the crowded churches, thronged equally with men and women (I am speaking of the Catholic churches), and the evidences of devotion on every side. I have paid long or short visits to Germany nearly every year for twenty years, and, looking back, I have no hesitation in saying that the attendance at public worship is increasing.

The 27th Article of the Federal Constitution of Switzerland lays down that "The public schools shall be so conducted that members of all religious denominations may attend them without offence to their liberty of conscience or of belief." It is impossible, however, to discuss the Swiss system, for it is not one, but many. Each canton has its own laws, and every variety of education, from secular to denominational, may be met with in this small country. There are a certain number of Voluntary schools, which receive no public grant, in cantons where the established system seriously injures the parental conscience.

---

* All Catholic teachers must receive the formal *missio canonica* from the bishops, who insist strongly on this point; indeed, from the training college onward the Catholic teacher finds himself in close touch with the Church's system. Protestant teachers have less connection with their religious communion.

† In the Rhenish provinces Protestant schools have been established for as few as thirty children.

When we come to Holland, we find a country where the history of the educational controversy is full of interest for us. Of the supporters of religious education, about three-fifths are members of the Calvinist, or Dutch Reformed, Church, and two-fifths Catholics. Before 1801 the education of the country was entirely in the hands of the Calvinists; in 1801 the principles of the French Revolution were introduced, all Christian teaching was prohibited, and the Protestant schools gave place to what were called *neuter* schools; this system was centralized by the law of 1806. "Neuter" is only a synonym, and a delightfully expressive one, for "undenominational." In these schools moral instruction is obligatory, but dogma is as far as possible forbidden. I say "as far as possible," because it is recognized that the existence of God, the Divine Providence, and the immortality of the soul, are truths too closely united with morality to be absolutely banished; but the Divinity of our Lord may not be taught if children of parents who object to it are present, and the prayer at the beginning and end of the lessons must be of such a character as to give offence to nobody. Biblical stories may be told, but the Holy Scriptures themselves must not be introduced into the school. Thus, whilst Holland invented "undenominationalism" in her "neuter" schools, England alone has submitted the Bible to the indignity of being made the text-book of this spadic Christianity. What has been the result? Different educational writers, notably Dr. Fitch, have pointed out the inevitable rebellion in Christian countries against mere secular education; the recent history of Holland shows exactly the same rebellion against undenominationalism. In 1848, under the new Dutch Constitution, the right of free religious education to exist was guaranteed, and by 1889 no less than twenty-seven per cent. of the children of Holland were to be found in the denominational schools. In 1857, denominational instruction by ministers of the different faiths was permitted in the neuter schools.* Finally, in the year 1888, Calvinists and Catholics agreed to forget their confessional differences and to stand shoulder to shoulder in defence of their common Christianity. A general election took place, the Liberal party fell from power, and in 1889 a Bill was passed by a great majority, which put an end to the ascendency of the neuter schools. By this law, the Voluntary or denominational schools, under easy conditions, may be subsidized by the State, the subsidy taking the form of fixed grants towards teachers' salaries, calculated on the basis of the number of scholars in the school, and given equally to denominational and neuter, or Board schools. This contribution from the State is calculated at about a quarter of the cost of maintenance; the children's pence provide not quite another quarter, and the subscriptions supply the rest.† Step by step, as we have seen, the denominational principle has advanced in Holland; the national tendency is in the direction of absolute equality before the law of denominational and neuter schools, and the entire responsibility of the State for all educational expenses. At the present time legislation of

---

* In 1892, in 786 neuter schools such instruction was given.

† In January, 1893, there were 1,295 denominational schools, of which 1,022 were subsidized by the State. Of these schools 685 were Protestant, 575 Catholic, 11 Jewish, and 24 which could not be ranked under any of these names.

this character is being pushed forward by what is called the anti-revolutionary party.

What can we learn from the study of Continental education? We can learn, firstly, that English Churchmen are not alone in their struggle for education on Christian principles; that Catholics, Eastern and Western, that Protestants—all, indeed, who love the name of Christ in Europe—are fighting the same battle in the different countries, and fighting it with considerable success. Secondly, we can learn not to be afraid. We are rapidly approaching a fresh development, if not, as I trust, a complete re-arrangement of our system of national education. Our opponents are preparing for the battle—in what do they put their trust? Arguments? Read their organs in the press, and you will find they presume upon our timidity; their columns are full of threats. "If you receive more public money for your schools, you shall have more public control," they say. Who is afraid of public control? Does public control in Germany mean the abrogation of the denominational principle? Have we strayed so far in England from the path of religious liberty that it is to be assumed without question that public control means the right of a majority to force their form of religious instruction upon a minority? Or, again, we are solemnly warned that if we Churchmen endeavour to get for the children of sober and industrious parents in Board schools that instruction in their religion which is granted to the children of the idle and the dissolute in the Industrial schools, we shall inevitably bring about secular education. As a matter of fact, there is not the least danger of secular education, and our opponents know well that the political party which proposed it would be overwhelmed by the public opinion of England. The secularist never had much chance of establishing himself in this country, and we have seen that he is losing rather than gaining ground on the Continent. In good truth we can afford to laugh at the secularist, but we must pay some little attention to his first cousin the neuter, that plausible person, who, having emasculated his own form of Christianity, is so extremely anxious to emasculate ours, and that at our expense, by the public and exclusive endowment of what he humorously calls the "citizen's interpretation" of the Bible. He must be followed, wherever found, and his pretensions to justice and liberty relentlessly exposed. It is impossible to believe that he has much vitality. On the Continent, as we have seen, he exists only in the little kingdom of Holland, and is there undergoing the process of being sat upon, by the joint effort of Protestants and Catholics. This suggests another lesson to be derived from the Continent of Europe. In countries where the secularist and neuter parties are strong, Christian men have won liberty for themselves and their children by sinking their confessional differences and uniting against the common enemy. The pressing need in England is a thorough understanding and close alliance for educational purposes with those who equally with Churchmen value definite religious instruction for their children.

One word in conclusion. You remember Ezekiel's vision of those wonderful creatures of God, the cherubim. There was one peculiarity about them which so impressed the prophet that he alludes to it more than once, "They went everyone straight forward: whither the spirit was to go, they went; they turned not when they went." Let us follow the

directness of the cherubim. We have the noblest of all causes, the little children of England, bought with Christ's precious blood, grafted into His holy Church. We have great principles to guide us, principles which were in existence long before you and I were born into the world, and which will remain unchangeable for the guidance of others long after we have crumbled away in the tomb. With these principles we dare not tamper; we cannot turn aside to the right hand or to the left to make compromises. We may make compromises about our earthly affairs, but not about the education of the little inheritors of the kingdom of heaven—no, not even to oblige Cæsar. Do we, bishops, clergy, and laity, need a watchword for the fight? Let us take it—"Straight forward."

NOTE.—The preparation of this paper has laid me under great obligations, not only to the Education Department, which placed valuable materials at my disposal, but to many kind correspondents in England and abroad, including members of the different embassies and legations accredited to this country, and British consuls and chaplains on the Continent.

The Rev. H. E. NOYES, D.D., Chaplain to the Embassy Church, Paris.

WHEN, with a view to this paper, I asked some questions of the Secretary of a leading Educational Society in London, he replied that there were only three men in England qualified to deal adequately with the subject of National Education in England. I am not one of them. Moreover, I am conscious that even were I attempting to deal with so vast a subject, I should stand before you at great disadvantage, having lived out of the country for nearly five years, during which time the question has assumed great and perplexing proportions. But the reason of my non-qualification to speak on the general subject may perhaps be taken as giving a special vantage ground from which to view at least one other national system of education, and will enable me to set before you some facts not too generally known in England, and from which a favourable or unfavourable comparison may be drawn. I said *one* National system, for it would be impossible for me in the short space of time allotted to say much of the systems in vogue in other parts of Europe besides France, where my lot is at present cast. Indeed, owing to the backward state of the question in some parts, I am not sure but that the subject might not well have been narrowed to National Education in England compared with France, Germany, and Austria. The extreme of denominationalism rules in some, the extreme of secularism in others, neither of which is desired by Churchmen generally in England.

Germany.—In Germany the religious difficulty seems to have been solved without violating the religious convictions of parents, though the results are not all that could be desired. Briefly it stands thus. In every Primary school the scholars are placed under the clergy of their own denomination for religious instruction. Every such clergyman is proposed by his own ecclesiastical authorities, and the consent of the State is necessary. His payment is guaranteed by the State, or by the

authorities where he is teaching. Where there are many scholars, especially young ones, the Bible Lessons (not the Catechism) are often undertaken by one of the masters or mistresses. The Ultramontane party in Germany are not content with this condition of things. They would like to have the power of dismissing a teacher who may not be in their opinion sufficiently devoted to the cause of the Vatican. They dislike the supervision of the State, and demand that they should be the masters of the school, the religious instruction, and of the teachers. Religious instruction forms a part of the school plan, and is given in the schoolroom. The final examination is under the control of the State, and no scholar is dismissed until the State is satisfied. The clergyman holds the School services in the church, and retains the control of them in his own hands. The masters and mistresses are trained in seminaries, separated according to sex, and a clergyman of their own denomination gives them their religious instruction and holds their services. Each denomination has its own seminary.

Austria.—With regard to the religious question in Austria, a correspondent well qualified to inform, writes:—"The schools here are *confessionslos*, literally without 'confession,' *i.e.*, masters and children can be Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Jews." Nevertheless, "religion" stands first on the list of subjects, and each child must receive religious instruction from the clergyman of his or her faith.

France.—Coming then to France, I would claim your indulgence while I briefly describe the system of National Education as it there exists. Before the Revolution, Elementary schools existed in France, but no effort was made for the advancement of education on any large scale until the middle of the present century. In 1850 a law was passed obliging every commune with a population of eight hundred to have a school for girls. Since 1878, however, education has advanced with rapid strides, and the standard of education raised. Three laws subsequent to 1878 now practically regulate the system of elementary education—(1) That of June 16th, 1881, which granted a free education; (2) that of March 28th, 1882, which secularized the schools and at the same time made attendance obligatory between the ages of six and thirteen and (3) that of October 30th, 1886, which laicised the teaching staff

Description.—A description of the system will not be unimportant in view of the subject before us. All instruction in France is divided into three orders—primary; secondary; and superior. The head of all instruction given by the State in France is the Minister of Public Instruction, and he is aided by a *Conseil Supérieur.* France is divided into sixteen "Acadamies"—*i.e.*, localities or towns, which are centres, as, *e.g.*, Paris, Lyons, Bordeaux, etc. Each "Acadamie" is independent in itself, but all are subject to the Minister of Public Instruction. The head of each "Acadamie" is a rector (lay), who is assisted by a *Conseil d'Académie.* There is no university in France exactly on the English or German systems. Our nearest approach to the French system is found, probably, in the University of London. A few words of explanation will be necessary of each of the branches of instruction.

Primary.—(1) Primary Education. All instruction given in the Primary schools is gratuitous, and no payment is exacted for books or other material. These schools deal with all children of the working

classes between the ages of six and thirteen, for whom they are compulsory. The secular instruction in these schools is of a high class, and leads to a *certificat d'Etude*, which is usually obtained between the ages of eleven and thirteen. There are some superior Primary schools in Paris and other large towns, formed of scholars who have passed in the Elementary Primary Schools, called *Ecoles Municipales Supérieures*, which are intended to prepare youths for commercial careers. There are six or seven of these in Paris. These are gratuitous; a proposal to exact a small payment has lately been rejected.

Secondary.—(2) Secondary Education. This branch may be said to be represented by the Lycées and colleges scattered through the country. Pupils are here prepared for examinations, especially for the Baccalaureat or B.A. degree, a degree not equivalent to that in our own universities, but answering more to our "little go," or "mods." This degree must be taken by all who would pass into the learned professions, but in no sense is a *qualification* for any of them. The Lycées in France will bear some comparison with the Public School in England, and are well arranged and roomy. One near my own house in Paris, the Lycée Janson, covers a space of 32,744 mètres (or yards). Few, however, of these institutions pay their own way, but require a subsidy from the State. In the Lycées there are eight classes, and pupils passing the seventh class satisfactorily receive a certificate, which is taken as an equivalent to the *certificat d'Etude* given to children at the end of their course in the Primary schools. These colleges are for the children of the paying classes, and the fees range from £4 to £16 a year for *externes*, and from £36 to £60 for boarders.

Superior.—(3) Superior education is for those students who have obtained the Baccalaureat in either arts or sciences, and is for the further study of medicine, law, theology, letters, pharmacy, etc. The lectures given to the students, *e.g.*, at the Sorbonne, are all free, but fees are charged for the examinations, which in some cases are considerable.

Position of Religion.—In all primary instruction given through the medium of the State, religion is not recognized. In other words, none is taught. The State is supposed to be neutral on the subject. Morality is taught (about which more directly), the basis of which is supposed to be conscience and duty (*Conscience et devoir*). For the teaching of moral subjects there is no *system* except that expressed in any particular book adopted, which may be chosen by the local authorities. Books teaching moral subjects are very numerous, a list of which is usually kept by the Municipality, from which the director of the schools makes a selection. Previous to 1880, teachers in the schools were allowed to prepare their scholars in the Catechism, and for their *Première Communion*, but this is now absolutely forbidden. The Cross has been removed from all primary schools, and priests or other religious teachers have no entrance as such, and no rights more than any lay person.

With regard to the Secondary schools, it may be said that here a profession of religion in some form is required, unless the parents have requested otherwise on the entrance of the child, and the State provides the instruction. The main teaching is, of course, according to the tenets of the Roman Church, and services are held in the chapel,

generally annexed to the Lycèes, on Sundays and Festivals. In some, religious teaching is given on the Thursday afternoons, which, being a general holiday, is not likely to command good attendances.

On certain days, usually once a week, a Pastor of the Reformed Church, or a Jewish Rabbi, paid by the State, and connected with the College, attend and give instruction to the scholars of their own denomination. It should be noticed, however, that religious instruction is not a part of the compulsory curriculum, but voluntary, and it will be easily understood what difficulties this one fact places in the way of the teachers of religion.

In Superior Education there are two theological faculties, one Roman Catholic and the other Reformed.

Free Schools.—But besides the State schools in France, there are a large number of schools described as free (*i.e.*, Voluntary), or Parochial schools. These are under the management of the Roman Catholic clergy, the Pastors of the Reformed Church, and Jewish Rabbis. With respect to these schools there is no State interference, except for authorization, inspection, sanitation, etc. Here religious teaching in all its forms is entirely free, and many of these are successful. Such schools, however, are not in favour with the Government, receive no State aid, and, owing to the increasing stringency of the law, are at a great disadvantage.

The Moral System.—In speaking of the system of morals taught in Primary schools in France, I would caution my brethren against quoting from a little manual entitled, "*Manuel de l'instruction laïque*," by M. Monteil, which contains the blankest Atheism, and worse. Several clergy have written to me to obtain this book with a view to quote it as if it were in present use. This is not the case. The manual was published in 1882, but, as far as I can ascertain, was never authorized, and certainly has not been generally used. It is not found in any Government school at present, or in any list from which books on morality are chosen for the schools. Now some of these books on morals in the authorized list contain no mention of God or the Bible at all. In others He is referred to, but only in the most vague and general terms, and that in a short chapter at the end of the book, as if religion were the least important subject of the treatise. To take, *e.g.*, two of the books largely used in Paris, written by M. J. Gérard, one for the younger children in Primary schools and the other for the more advanced. In the first there are ten chapters, with the following titles:—"One ought to be honest; To listen to conscience; To be a good son; A good mother; A good scholar; A good friend; A good little Frenchman; To be just and good; To correct one's faults; To love the good." Under these different headings are stories by way of illustration, drawn from French history or the imagination of the writer. It is under the last heading—"One should love the good"—and here only, that we find any reference to a Divine Being. A sub-heading reads: "To love the good is to love God;" and about half a page contains all that is said on the subject. Here are the two principal sentences which contain all that is taught to the younger French children upon what we deem the greatest of all subjects. After speaking of the wonders of Nature, he says:—"But come down to yourselves, my children; listen to your conscience; it is then you will find the

revelation of God the most direct and exalted. The spectacle which you will see is also beautiful, perhaps more beautiful than that of the starred heaven. For the law of justice and love which instructs the soul is more beautiful than that which regulates the stars; and the invisible world which forms all our consciences, united to the conscience of God, is more beautiful than the material world in all its splendour." Again: "He who obeys best the voice of conscience, is he who fulfils best his rights towards God. To force yourself to do better, to do all the good you can, to set a good example, and to behave well to others, is the best way to prove to God our recognition and our respect." For want of time I have only quoted from one book, but I know of no other which goes nearer to what one would desire. But is it better as the scholars get older? We take up the book of the same writer in continuation of his smaller work. Here the teaching is for the *Cours moyen et Supérieur.* It is a manual of ten chapters, with the titles—Duty before everything; Nothing is of more value than a united family; A good scholar makes a good man; Man is made for society; He should be just; Kind; Patriotic; A good citizen, He should respect himself, war against his passions, and correct his faults; and tenth, "To love the good is to love God." That is to say, the writer has given much more advanced teaching as to the social and patriotic virtues, but he has little or nothing more to say on the subject of religion. A few sentences in the same strain as those quoted above contain all that is taught on the subject. Would English Churchmen, would English parents, be satisfied with such defective teaching as this?

Le droit d'accroissement.—A great struggle is pending as to whether this system I have described is to hold undisputed sway in France; and a struggle which threatens the existence of the Voluntary schools. The subject is a burning one in the country at present, and one of which we shall hear a good deal more before the end of the year. I refer to the new law regulating the taxing of religious societies, and especially burdensome to the teaching orders. This law is known as *le droit d'accroissement*—the law of growth—an expression which requires more explanation than the dictionary gives. It is a question of great importance, and kindred to one which may be warmly discussed by us in the future. Let me explain. At the beginning of the century, in the period of the Revolution, religious orders were all suppressed, and their property confiscated. But under the Restoration, and especially under the second Empire, they were very largely restored. These orders all acquired property, and this property escaped one form of taxation, viz.: that of succession duty, which in France is high. Under the old Monarchy, when an order acquired property it paid a certain fixed tax, once for all, in lieu of succession duty; but after the Revolution there was nothing answering to this, and it was to remedy this state of things that the law of mortmain was passed in 1849.

Under this law the orders paid an annual tax, calculated at the rate of 62½ centimes per cent. of the land tax, or *contribution foncière.* This annual tax was regarded by many as unduly favourable to the orders.

To remedy this the law "Brisson" was passed in 1880, by which the orders were made subject to the ordinary law of succession duty at strangers' rate, viz.: 11¼ per cent. This Brisson law regarded the

members of the order as holding the property in equal shares. Suppose a case in which there were one hundred members, and the property worth £10,000, each member's share would be £100. When one died the ninety and nine who remained were his heirs, and the law said that they were so much the richer for his death, whence the term *accroissement*—growth. On this *accroissement* duty was charged at the rate of 11¼ per cent. This law was, however, uncertain in its application, and in many cases the result was confiscation, not taxation. In one instance the death of a sister required eight hundred declarations on stamped paper! Her share in the property was valued at 2,300 francs, and the duty and expenses amounted to 2,280 francs. The present laws are intended to put an end to this state of things, and at the same time to deal with the property of religious communities; but as they now stand, they will tend to the ruin of especially the teaching orders. The order of April 16th, 1895 (*loi Ap.* 16, 1895), is the one which is being warmly discussed in the public press. By it the succession duty is replaced by an annual tax of 30 centimes per 100 francs in the case of authorized orders, and 40 centimes in the case of the non-authorized. This tax is to be levied on all property, whether it be real or personal. The tax is annual, and must be paid before the first quarter of the year following, under a penalty of 50 per cent. of the tax due, and a *minimum* fine of 100 francs. Certain associations are exempted: *e.g.*, "Properties acquired with the authorization of the Government, so far as they are employed and continue to be actually employed in works of gratuitous assistance to the infirm, the sick, poor, orphans, or foundlings, and in the work of the French Foreign Missions. Exemption will be granted or withdrawn in any case only by a decree issued by the Council of State."

It will be seen from this extract from the law, that the teaching orders are not exempt from the tax. How, then, will this apply?

Example.—Take an example which will best illustrate it, given by the Bishop of Nancy, "A community is mentioned which has a gross value set upon their property for the purposes of taxation of 20,000,000 francs. Under the law of 1884, their estimated revenue of 5 per cent. on this sum would be a million francs, and the 4 per cent. tax to be paid would be 40,000 francs. (Be it noted this property is largely in buildings.) Now under the new law they have to pay 30 centimes per cent. on the gross value; that is, 60,000 francs, or half as much again as formerly. Besides this, the tax of 1884 has not been paid by them for ten years past, and the Government presents them with its little account for arrears of 400,000 francs, to be paid, with legal charges, within six months"—£16,000 down, and £2,400 a year after, besides the ordinary, or mortmain, tax. Few can stand this.

Authorized and Non-authorized Orders.—The law from which I have quoted refers to associations authorized and non-authorized. This needs a word of explanation. There are five religious orders in France authorized by the State, these are:—

(1) The Brothers of the Christian Schools.
(2) The Sulpiciens.
(3) The Lazarites.
(4) The Sisters of S. Vincent de Paul.
(5) The little Sisters of the Poor.

The other orders are not recognized by the State in any way, as, *e.g.*: The Jesuits, Dominicans, Carmelites, Benedictines, etc.

The following are some of the debts of the authorized orders. The Brothers of the Christian Schools owe the Government 500,000 francs; the Lazarites 250,000 francs; the Sulpiciens 150,000 francs. This will give some idea of the state of affairs, which must come to a crisis this very month. For some weeks past the Press has been discussing the question. Some have counselled resistance to the last, by all; others, submission, at least by the authorized orders. Under the threat of the withdrawal of authorization, it would seem, however, that the milder counsel will prevail. It is seen that the consequence of withdrawal of authorization would be very serious, and would mean confiscation. Here is Article 7 of the Law of May 24th, 1895 (*loi May*, 1895): "In case of the extinction of a society, or religious house for women, or the *repeal of authorization*, the property acquired by gift between living persons or by disposition after death will be returned to the donors, or their relatives in succession; also to those of testators in the same degree. As to the property which cannot be returned, or which has been acquired—*à titre onereux* (having paid duties)—it will be annexed and divided, half to the ecclesiastical establishments and half to the hospitals in the departments in which the establishments which are extinguished are situated." All this bears very closely and directly upon the subject before us; a Government which, in 1882, secularized the schools, and has since banished religion from Primary education, is now, apparently, about to force a law which will take away the property from those orders who, in conjunction with others, have been the means of giving religious instruction in the Voluntary (free) schools. It is only fair, however, to state that a strong body, and that not altogether of the secularist party, argue that the taxation is just, and ought to be applied.

Results.—A few words as to the results of the French system in the country itself. So far as attendance at the State Primary schools is concerned, the results can hardly be satisfactory to the authorities. There are thousands of parents in France who absolutely refuse to send their children to schools where the futile attempt is made to be neutral upon the subject of religion, and the Free (Voluntary) schools are steadily making way, although the tide of legislation is so strong against them. What has happened is this. When the schools were secularized, the religious teaching orders, or others favourable to religious instruction, Roman Catholic and Reformed, started private or denominational schools. The Government has not prevented this, and the consequence has been that there is a competition for the children going on in all parts of the country. These private (denominational) schools have been in a large measure successful. A new volume of statistics has just been published ("*Statistique de l'Enseignement Primaire*," vol. xv., 1895), which gives the following significant figures. During the past three years, the Infant schools, *les Écoles maternelles*, have suffered a diminution in numbers, but notwithstanding this they still have a superiority in that respect of 4 per cent. over the Secular schools. It is different, however, in the case of the Primary schools. Here the superiority of the Free (denominational) schools affirms itself strongly. In the years 1886-87, the children in the Secular schools numbered

4,505,109; in 1891-92 (the latest published), the number is reduced to 4,281,183, making 223,926 children less in the Government schools. On the other side, the private (Voluntary) schools have gained 211,307 scholars, and the total number of children under instruction in these schools has been raised from 916,253 in the years 1886-87, to 1,127,560 in 1891-92. What better proof could there be that the Secular schools are unpopular, and that this unpopularity is increasing? Naturally, the Republican Press (*Lanterne*, July, 1895) is asking why the Government allow these denominational schools to exist, which they say are hostile to the Republic. This party would no doubt rejoice were the religious teaching orders suppressed; those orders which—while we may not agree with all they teach—have yet done much in the past to keep alive religious feeling among the children of the working classes in France.

Juvenile Crime.—That there has been a rapid increase of crime by juveniles during the past twenty years in France there can be no reasonable doubt; yet I am conscious that in statistics with regard to it, we do not find the strongest argument against a system of National Education. Some (Poletti) have said that "every development of vice in a country is counterbalanced by a corresponding development of virtue," and no doubt there are other factors besides the number of criminals to be taken into consideration. But, allowing for these, I think most will agree that where there is a marked and rapid increase of juvenile crime in any country, a large proportion may be traced to a defective education. In the Report of the National Society, June 12th, 1895, there is a reference on this subject to the recently published report on the criminal portion of the judicial statistics for England with the following comment: "We find it stated in the report on official authority that juvenile crime has enormously increased. The proportion of criminals under twenty-one years of age is not less than 41 per cent. We also deduce from these statistics that offences against morality have also increased in a manner which it is very difficult to account for on any other ground than a general deterioration of the morality of the people." This is a striking statement. The Duchess of Rutland, speaking on this subject some six weeks ago, quoted the following noble words:—"The establishment of Christian Education is to arrest crime at the fountain head. It is to cut off the main supplies from the great torrent of National immorality. It is to bring heads and hearts, during the period when they are most impressionable, under those blessed influences which make crime unwelcome, and which enlist its votaries, victims in the cause of virtue."

The state of things in France is deplorable. The prisons are gorged with juvenile criminals, and it has been lately necessary to open another large prison to accommodate them.

The whole truth is not found, moreover, in statistics. In the Report of the Minister of Justice for 1893, the last published, we find that with regard to criminals under sixteen years of age, that the minister and his predecessors invited the magistrates to pursue less activity, and to condemn less often the younger criminals, and rather to send them back to their parents. To a large extent this advice has been followed, and consequently we do not know the full extent of the mischief.

Low Moral Tone.—There has, moreover, been of late years a distinct

lowering of the moral tone, which writers are deploring, and in many cases tracing to the want of religious education. What would be thought in England if a Board School Inspector on a prize-giving day gave utterance to sentiments like those expressed by the Mayor of Charlville in August this year to the young girls of the Communal school! When distributing the prizes, he said, "Under the influence of a slow but continuous transformation which operates in you, and with the habit of analysing your sensations, you will one day understand that you are not in this world for yourself alone. Even your dear parents, for whom you have the liveliest tenderness, will no longer suffice to absorb your whole thoughts. Insensibly led by your imagination—*cette folle du logis*—they soar, and seek the one thing which it needs, which is, to fill your whole mind and your whole heart, and in this fluttering quest your dream asserts itself, takes a form. You compose this form as you like: you deck it out, give to it the most chivalrous virtues, and when you have created so handsome, so seductive a being, you adore it on your two knees. Is it necessary to add that this *Divine Being*, so beloved in secret, this unknown one who moves your heart, is always ornamented with a pair of moustaches!" (*Temps*, Aug. 7th, 1895.) And further on in the speech, this worthy Mayor said to the young girls that "the mystery was to ascertain whether the moustaches would be black or brown, red or fair!"

In a little book by the Abbé Bonnot, entitled "*Les fruits de l'Ecole sans Dieu*," we have a mass of testimony on this subject. It is too long to quote, but he gives statistics and instances to show the rapid increase among the young of impiety, physical and moral corruption, revolt against authority, assassinations, and suicides. He eloquently writes: "Take care! If you take away God from our schools, if you forbid that He be spoken of except in a room for Catechism twice a week, two hours at the most, on the holidays only, it is certain that the child will soon say good-bye to God, of whom he will remark that you yourself think so little. Then, logically, he will equally say good-bye to morality, to discipline and authority, and to all law ancient and modern."

Dissatisfaction.—Murmurs of dissatisfaction at the present state of things are heard on all hands. Statesmen, Judges, and others occupying positions of influence, express themselves as deeply concerned, both as to present results and the probable future consequences. Some complain that the law obliging all children to attend school ought to be more rigorously enforced. M. Mullot, Director of the Colony of S. Maurice, speaking at the *Congress Pènitentiare Internationale* this year, said: "It is to be noticed that most of these little vagabonds have never attended any school. It seems, however, that there exists a law, dated March 28th, 1882, which renders assistance obligatory for children to attend school from the age of six to thirteen. It is not for me to criticize the way in which this law is applied, but I have noticed that the children sent to the Reformatory schools at S. Maurice are illiterate to the proportion of 70 per cent., and, at best, can barely read and write." Other writers lament the lack of religious instruction. A pamphlet, entitled "*L'Enfance*," has just been published by M. Adolphe Guillot, *Juge d'instruction au Tribunal de la Seine*, in which, treating of the child vagabond and its

possible preservation by the school, he says: "School and prison are two terms immediately opposed to one another, and yet they sum up the Penitentiary problem. With schools where the teaching would train the soul, our prisons would be less full, and with prisons which would be as schools, the youths detained there would not become hardened. Primary education was made obligatory by the law of March 28th, 1882. All the children must attend the school which the Commune places freely at their disposition. The law decided that the schools should be *laïque*—that, in cotemporary language, means schools where the idea of God is absent. These are the schools where attendance is obligatory. Only parents with certain resources have the power of instructing the children in the Free (Voluntary) schools. . . It seemed to the framers of this law that the schoolmaster, invested with considerable power, installed in luxurious schools, would soon exercise a sovereign influence on the morality of the young people. The results—from the criminal point of view—have not had this effect, as in other countries in which the scholars have not been separated from religious influences, as *e.g.*, in England. . . . The diminution of criminality in France has not answered to the extension of instruction." I may add that M. Guillot is a man well known and of large influence in Paris. In 1889 it was he who called public attention to the fact that the increase of juvenile crime was beyond doubt co-incident with the changes introduced into the public instruction.

Conclusion.—What conclusion, then, may we draw from a comparison between our own system of National education and that of our neighbours. I would say that we have much to be thankful for with respect to religion in our Primary schools. *At least*, the Board in any district may determine whether there shall be religious instruction or no. In France it is not so. The local authorities have no voice in the question at all. The conscience of the parent is controlled by the State, and the State has decided against the teaching of religion in Primary schools.

We may be thankful, too, that in our schools the Holy Bible is the text-book on moral subjects. I have shown that the system in France contains but, at best, the barest recognition of a Divine Being. Indeed, I may go further. The *basis* of moral teaching in France is not the revealed mind of God as found in the sacred Scriptures, or the example we have in the perfect moral character of Christ; but rather some such general foundation as the "rights of man" and the authority of "conscience"—a faculty here given an almost Divine position. A child brought up in a French Government school as far as the age of thirteen, will have from thence no knowledge of the Bible, of the mystery of the Incarnation, or of the life, death, and resurrection of the Saviour of the world. Finally, I would urge that the comparison says to the Englishman who would secularize our schools, "Take care what you are about." Experience in France proves that it is impossible to be neutral on the subject of religion in Primary schools; that it is not possible to frame a system of morals apart from revealed religion, which will guard the nation from Atheism and Anarchy. In France, "with religious instruction, all teaching of morality has disappeared. Almost everywhere moral education is either dying out or altogether non-existent" (Lichtenberger). And, moreover, the

experience of France shows that such a system is not likely to be *National.*

And the comparison says to Englishmen in favour of retaining religious instruction in all primary education, "This is more than a question of Church and State, it is a question which concerns the moral welfare of the nation. You are fighting a righteous battle against the tyranny of the secularist, and for God and religious liberty."

ADDRESS.

(1) In England, as compared with the Colonies.

The Rev. Richard Gooch Fowell, Assistant Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society.

I have been asked to speak on the subject of education in England as compared with the colonies, because I have been engaged as a teacher for a large part of my life, and because I have spent five years as a teacher of theology in one of the principal British colonies—viz., in Canada.

Let me say at starting that I have found it impossible in the time allotted to me to do more than allude to the work of national education, paid out of the rates, and open free to all, in the colony with which I was connected. From what I have read, it appears to me that the same state of things prevails more or less in the other colonies; in fact that from one you may learn them all. I would further say that I do not presume to criticize, still less to condemn, the policy which prevails in our colonies as regards national education. As I understand it, the intention of taking up the subject at all is to apply to ourselves in England any lessons which we may gather from the experience of our brethren beyond the seas.

The present position of the Church of England in Canada arises partly from the special difficulties connected with a new country of vast extent, very thinly populated, and not too well provided with this world's goods; it arises also largely from political causes beyond the control of the present inhabitants.

Let me remind my hearers that out of the 9,000,000 square miles of which our empire consists, one-third is in North America, that out of Canada you could carve forty countries as large as Great Britain, or three British Indias, or sixteen German Empires. Contrast with this enormous area the comparatively small number of inhabitants, less than 5,000,000, and the difficulty of providing religious privileges and education, or even secular education, will be at once apparent. We must further take into account the presence of nearly 2,000,000 French and Irish Roman Catholics, and the fact that our own Church numbers not more than 700,000 souls.

Nothing can be more instructive to us, as members of an established Church, than to notice the enormous advantage in the way of wealth and influence that has accrued to the Roman Church in Canada as a *quasi*-Established Church in the province of Quebec ever since the days of the French occupation of the country. The conquest from France of the province of Quebec was completed in the year 1759. In the treaty which preceded the surrender the French Commander manifested a very earnest zeal for the maintenance of all the privileges previously granted to the Roman Church by the French King. The rights, privileges, and lands held by the Roman Church previous to the conquest were primarily secured to that Church by the articles of capitulation, and eventually confirmed by Act of the British Parliament in 1774.

By this Act, in the province of Quebec, at least, the Church of Rome is recognized

as *the* Established Church, or certainly *an* Established Church. Yet the Church of England was not entirely neglected in this legislative measure, for it is expressly provided therein that—

"It should be lawful for his Majesty, his heirs, or successors, to make such provision out of the said accustomed dues and rights (pertaining to the Crown), for the encouragement of the Protestant religion, and for the maintenance and support of a Protestant clergy, within the said province, as should from time to time be thought necessary and expedient."

Two years later—viz., in 1776—the independence of the United States was declared. One result of the war was to drive a considerable body of British subjects, numbering, perhaps, 25,000, away from the States, and mostly into the region now known as the province of Ontario. These men sacrificed all their earthly possessions to their loyalty to the British Crown. It is instructive to remember that the great majority of them were Churchmen. The only boon they asked was that in the wilderness in which they were about to seek a refuge, they might have the institutions, in Church and state, for which they had so long contended, secured to them and to their children. Accordingly, in 1791, George the Third expressed his wish that sufficient provision should be made by law for the support of a Protestant clergy in Canada. We have no time to examine how it was that this kindly and honourable purpose was in great measure frustrated, but frustrated it was, and the endowments remaining to the Church of England in Canada are all too few to provide for a sufficient number of clergy and for secular education on Church lines. Meanwhile, the Church of Rome enjoys in the province of Quebec all her old endowments, enormously increased in value, while both there and in the province of Ontario she receives from the State the proportion of taxes contributed by Roman Catholics for education, so that she educates all her children in separate schools, where religion holds the place which it rightly claims, and its recognition is enforced at every turn. No other religious body enjoys the same advantages; in fact, it is contrary to the genius of the country that any of its citizens should be separately trained. The object in the minds of Canadian statesmen is to develop a national rather than a sectarian feeling, to make the young of both sexes grow up Canadians rather than Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, or Methodists. There is something to be said on this side. A new country, struggling into existence, must needs foster by every means the growth of national feeling, and must discourage everything that would tend to keep its citizens apart in rival camps, with separate interests and convictions. Yet, when the sacrifice involved in a free and national system of education is nothing less than the sacrifice of all religious teaching of any satisfactory kind, we must admit that the price paid is very serious, and almost ruinous.

Hitherto the subject of education has been considered entirely a provincial matter, to be dealt with by each province at its own sole discretion, but in the province of Manitoba, the recent action of the Dominion Government in trying to override the local decision not to countenance separate schools, may prove the beginning of a new policy.

At present, education is a provincial question, there are as many school codes as provinces, and religion outside the Church of Rome fares equally badly in them all.

The fact remains that up to this time, amongst the various religious bodies outside the Church of Rome, the only substantial efforts to provide national education in Canada on a religious basis are—first, that which has been maintained in Newfoundland by the Colonial and Continental Church Society now for seventy years. About two thousand children, whose parents are mainly fishermen, are now under instruction

in the society's schools, and the basis of the educational system there in force is "
fear of the Lord, which is the beginning of wisdom."

The second effort is the provision made by the Government of Quebec in 1869
the education in that province of the children of the Protestant minority. Yet
real history of Protestant education in the province of Quebec only dates from the y
1876, when enlarged powers of independent action were first exercised by
Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction.

From a much earlier period the minority had enjoyed the privilege of sepa
schools, but from that date the schools have been under better supervision and m
complete organization. The great drawback still connected with them is the misera
pittance provided for the teachers, and the neglect of French in the country distr
as a compulsory system of instruction. As long as Protestants and Roman Catho
are trained, not only in separate schools, but also in different languages, it is
probable that they will amalgamate or have many sympathies and national feeling
common. At the same time, teachers who are qualified in the two languages are
likely to be found while the average salary is no more than £3 a month over a scl
year of only eight months.

It is the opinion of the Rev. Mr. Rexford, rector of the High School, Montr
that the continued existence of the Protestant minority is closely bound up with
maintenance of efficient and separate elementary schools. He therefore urges wea
men in the province to contribute gifts by which the efficiency of these schools
be enhanced.

Turning now to the province of Ontario, with a population of rather more
two million, an entirely different picture is presented. English is the prevailing
almost universal language, except in the Eastern townships. Out of six hun
thousand young people of school age, no more than forty thousand are Roman Catho
and attending separate schools. All the rest are trained together without distinc
The system is most elaborate and complete, as it is in the province of Quebec.

Every stage of education, from the most elementary, leads on to one more advan
until the Provincial University crowns the work. Bishop Hellmuth, the se
Bishop of Huron, taught the State how to supply the intermediate stage by establis
a boys' college at London, Ontario, of which the present Bishop of Toronto was
for some years. This served as a model for the present collegiate institutes.

I am able to judge of the excellence of the text-books and of the thoroughn
the instruction afforded in two ways: my own boys were grounded in the text-b
and have more than held their own in English schools, while several of my theol
pupils at Huron College were certificated teachers, who displayed a wonderful fa
for acquiring knowledge, and great skill in applying themselves to different bra
of study.

Practically, no religion is taught in the public schools of Ontario. A
years ago the Provincial Government issued a selection of Bible-readings
prayer which the trustees of any particular school may authorize to be read.
selection is known as the Ross Bible, which is still a legal book for the scho
Ontario, though not in general use. It is a book of beautiful selections,
for their literary merit, but not containing any continuous or satisfactor
of God's revelation to mankind. The Christian instinct of the community
rejected it, but nothing has been provided to take its place. At prese
maximum of religious observance in school is the use of the Lord's Prayer at o
According to law, in the province of Ontario, the clergy of the various c
are permitted to retain the children of their own denominations for half
at the close of afternoon school, but this is a practical impossibility. This c

of things is not only felt to be unsatisfactory, but it is producing unpleasant fruit. There is a cry very generally raised on behalf of religious instruction, that it should become a definite part of the school course, and a compulsory subject of examination. Every Anglican Synod, I believe, from the General down to the various diocesan synods, has pronounced in favour of such a reform, so has the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and likewise, in a less decided tone, the Methodist Conference. Further than this, the school trustees at Kingston, in Ontario, have decided to introduce into the school course for this year the international series of Sunday-school lessons, and the children should be examined in them concurrently with the other subjects. If this experiment proves successful, and be generally copied, the vexed question of religious education in public schools will be solved for Ontario, and a priceless spiritual advantage will have been gained.

The result of leaving religion out of count in the national scheme of education is seen when the children are brought up to be prepared for confirmation, although the universal popularity of the Sunday-school serves in some measure as a corrective. Yet one lesson in a week is a poor exchange for daily systematic instruction in the things that a Christian ought to know. It seems to me that by leaving religion out of count in every day education there is not only the loss of systematic teaching, but that a worse result is the inference that an intelligent child will draw—viz., that faith and practice can properly be divorced, that the truths which we profess on Sunday can be kept apart, and need not be taken into account during the remaining days of the week.

All that I have seen beyond the Atlantic strengthens my conviction that the clergy at home have a wonderful advantage arising from their connection with national education, and that the sacrifices which they are called upon to make in order to maintain their schools are in the highest degree pious and necessary sacrifices.

May the day be far distant when they shall be tempted or compelled to resign this duty into the hands of the State, and thus leave for others to discharge an obligation of the first importance which properly rests upon themselves.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

MR. E. ROBERTS TUXFORD requests permission to ask a question of Dr. Noyes. As I have no cards sent to me of gentlemen wishing to take part in the discussion, I do not think I shall be acting contrary to the laws of the Congress if I ask Mr. Tuxford to put his question.

E. ROBERTS TUXFORD, Esq., Norwich.

I WISH to ask, in the name of several here who are interested in the question of education, whether the Speakers who have given us the benefit of their experience—and perhaps more particularly Dr. Noyes—whether he can give us a little more information on a very important subject, and one which has been left out in these addresses, which have been necessarily cut short, namely, the training of teachers in these public schools. We have had accounts of the teaching in primary schools and secondary schools, but nothing very definite as to the training of teachers, and I would

like to ask whether Dr. Noyes could supplement what he has told us by some particulars as to the training of teachers, and also the work of such societies as that founded in France by the celebrated Jean Baptiste de la Salle. I am sure we should all be very glad to have some information on this point. I think everyone who takes an interest in this work will agree with me that the training of teachers is a most important part of education, and if, as in the case of England, they are trained through our elementary schools, they are people feeling the same difficulty that many of our teachers do here. I know there are teachers who are working away at their degrees who are hampered by want of literary training in our elementary schools. I want to know whether that is the case in France and other places, or whether they have a better system of training than we have reached in England.

The Rev. Dr. NOYES, Paris.

WITH regard to the question which has been asked by the gentleman who has just been on the platform, I may say that I am not able at short notice to give him a great amount of information about the training of teachers for public schools in France. What I know is this, that there are training colleges, and that they are very well managed, and that the system seems, as far as I have been able to understand, equal to the system in our own country. But I must remind you that with regard to the question of religion, nothing can be more deplorable than the state of things in the training colleges in France among the teachers. In fact, to use a vulgar expression, it pays for a teacher to declare himself an atheist. There is no definite religious teaching whatever in the training schools for teachers, and when we remember that these men have to go out to teach in schools, where they are supposed to be neutral on the subject of religion, we must see how difficult this is. I feel I ought not to say more. I have not gone into the question carefully, and it is not easy at a moment's notice to answer a question of that kind.

S. ANDREW'S HALL,

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 8TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

MEETING FOR MEN ONLY.

SOCIAL EVILS OF THE AGE.

(1) IMPURITY.

(2) GAMBLING.

ADDRESSES.

THE PRESIDENT opened the meeting with an eloquent address on the subject of "Purity."

MR. THOMAS MASON, Birmingham.

(Representing a Deputation of Working-men from Birmingham.)

WILL you allow me, in the first place, to thank you for giving me an opportunity of speaking to the working-men of Norwich who are attending this meeting of the Congress, and permit me to say, as a working-man, how deeply I feel my responsibility in attempting to address this assembly, because I am quite aware that on this

platform around me, and in front of me, are men of great ability, far better able to touch upon the subject of gambling, on which I propose to address the meeting, in the hope that I may be able to give a little good advice to my fellow working-men of Norwich. The Dean of Norwich, who is a very great favourite with the working-men of Birmingham, and Archdeacon Emery, assured me that as a working-man from Birmingham I would receive a very hearty welcome from the working-men of Norwich. I addressed a meeting of working-men at Ipswich last night, and I was asked what I would speak upon, and I replied that I was entirely in the hands of the chairman, the Archdeacon of Southwark. I said that I did not think I could speak upon any other subject better to working-men than that of home life. I suppose the working-men of Norwich are pretty much upon a level with the working-men of Ipswich or of Birmingham, and I cannot do wrong in speaking of the terrible curse of gambling which so much affects the working classes. In this Congress many points connected with the interests of working-men will be touched upon, such as impurity, gambling friendly societies, old age pensions, and other topics. These are all questions vitally affecting your interest, my brother working-men. I happen to be president of a society composed of six thousand working-men, and I happen to know something of what is going on in the city. I tell you, whatever it may be here in Norwich, that in Birmingham and in the Midland Counties the great sin of gambling is everywhere. Never in the history of the nation—and despite all efforts of eloquent preachers and teachers, of whom we have heard one to-night, the Bishop of Norwich, whose speech ought to be written in letters of gold and circulated throughout the length and breadth of the land—never, I say, in the history of this country, has gambling been carried on to such an enormous extent as it is at the present moment. It is our duty to try to check the enormous evil which has arisen from it. And how is that to be done? Working-men must themselves put their foot down, for they want to stamp out this evil, this abominable sin of gambling. Boys and girls in the Midland Counties make bets every day in the week. I say it is a most awful thing! We know the evils which arise from it. Men, women, and children are indulging in the sin of gambling. It is said that the Prince of Wales, and the late premier, and other men make bets. What is that to do with me? Two wrongs do not make a right. I care not if the Prince of Wales makes a bet to-morrow and loses his money. He can do so if he likes, but I will take care that the bookmakers do not get a penny of mine. I read in a paper the other day a remark of an editor, who supposed that there was no man who had not at one time or another put a shilling upon the Derby. I wrote to that editor and said that I was one who had never put a shilling on the Derby, and never intended to. What are we to do to put a stop to gambling? In the Midlands, bookmakers are fined forty shillings and five pounds. They pay the money, and they come up again, perhaps next week, thanks to the vigilance of the Birmingham police. Not a week passes but they are brought up. How can we remedy that? I say, send the vagabonds to prison. If the police catch these men making bets with boys and girls, let the magistrates send them to prison for seven days; and then they would take care, if possible, not to appear again. The magistrates of Wolverhampton made a bye-law against this betting, but the bookmakers managed to evade it by taking up positions just outside the borough boundaries, where they received money from those who wished to bet. I say it is the duty of all people to stamp out this abominable sin of gambling. But let me tell the clergymen—to whom I have sometimes to administer hard knocks—I would suggest that they would do well in their bazaars not to permit lotteries for prizes. On one occasion a man who was newly married offered a twenty-five pound note to be raffled for at a bazaar. I suppose he did it to show off before his young wife. Happily a local newspaper took up the matter and pointed out that if the Church was to be sustained in this way, it had better go altogether. The sooner such lotteries for prizes at bazaars are abolished the better. Once more I say that it is our duty to set our foot down upon this enormous evil, and to endeavour to persuade our fellow working-men to

"——————strike the blow,
And lay the great oppressor low."

The Right Hon. the EARL OF MEATH.

MEN of Norwich, I have accepted an invitation from your Bishop to address you to-night on the subject of purity. I do not come here either to preach or to lecture. I have no desire, neither have I the right, to do the one or the other. If I speak to

you to-night on this most difficult subject, I shall do so, not as a teacher, not as possessed of any special knowledge or superior virtue, God forbid ; but on the simple platform of our common humanity, and, as I hope, of our common desire—poor, weak, erring creatures as most of us are—to help each other to rise to the higher, rather than to descend to the lower life. It is well to recognize at the outset of this discussion that the sexual passion, when regulated and kept within control, is not one of which man need be ashamed. If we believe that man has been created by a Divine Being, we must acknowledge that this passion has been placed in his breast by the Creator, and if we believe that God is incapable of evil, we must beware in our hatred of impurity of falling into the error of the early Anchorites, who, because men abused a gift of God, found fault with the work of their Creator, and endeavoured by self-mutilation to improve, as they considered, His handiwork, and blasphemously attempted to alter the whole course of nature as fashioned by the Almighty.

God has endowed man with rational and intellectual as well as physical powers, and has bestowed upon him the gift of free will. In the case of the animals, instinct does not, as a rule, permit them to abuse their powers ; but man can, if he choose, destroy himself and others by the unbridled exercise of natural functions, which, if regulated, would only have conduced to his welfare. A pure man is, therefore, one who is master over his own thoughts and body, and who keeps his natural and healthy passions in continual check, and never permits them to obtain the command of his intellect, his judgment, or his conscience. A pure man must, consequently, to a certain extent, be a strong, manly, and masterful man, for he knows how to rule within the confines of his own physical and intellectual kingdom ; whilst the impure man, however much he may strut and hector, must equally, to a certain extent, of necessity be a weak and unmanly man, for he is the slave of his own passions, thoughts, and habits.

And yet the very contrary of this is often the popular notion. Not infrequently it is the wild, reckless, undisciplined youth who seeks his own pleasure, regardless of the happiness of others, who becomes for a time the hero of the young and thoughtless around him. But the bubble reputation soons bursts. His comrades, as they grow older, perceive how despicable are the qualities which at one time they admired; and even the vicious, though they imitate his conduct, despise in their hearts both themselves and him.

The vices which commit the greatest havoc amongst young men are impurity, gambling, and drunkenness; and of these three I am inclined to believe that the former is by far the most deadly in its extent and effects. It is a vice most difficult to combat either in one's self or in others, for it not infrequently happens that the very defences which with great toil and trouble we have raised against the enemy have. before we know it, in some mysterious manner already fallen into his possession, and have become the outworks of his attack. The bravest and most successful Christian soldiers have long ago discovered that impurity is a vice hard for man to combat, and that instant and unhesitating flight on the first sight of danger is usually the wisest course for an ordinary mortal to pursue.

When a man should fly, and when he should fight, is a question which can only be answered by the man himself, according to the nature of the temptation and the influence which experience has taught him this particular form of evil has the power of exercising upon him. To some men all things are pure; to others, many things innocent in themselves are constantly suggesting impurity of thought. One thing, however, is quite certain, that the more we allow our minds to be occupied by loose thoughts, the more readily will they return. We cannot, therefore, be too particular in guarding the portals of our thoughts, for thoughts produce acts, and acts habits, and habits enchain the man.

. . . . . .

It is possible, therefore, for men who are unable to marry to live pure lives, if only they will from early youth make up their minds that they will, God helping them, *never* yield to indulgence in the unlawful pleasures of the flesh; for, alas, it is too true that when once this vice obtains complete possession of a man it changes his whole nature, and turns him into a dangerous beast, hurtful to himself and his fellows, and incapable of guidance or control through reason or intellect.

Almost all men will denounce as a villain and worthy of severe punishment the man who takes advantage of a woman's weakness and violates her in opposition to her will; but there are some who will draw a line between this and obtaining the object of their desire by fraud and deception ; whilst others, who will condemn such an act, will profess to find no sin or a venial one in the seduction of a girl, if only she

can, by cajoling or by working on her affection, be brought to consent to her own ruin; but the law of God and the common sense of man makes no such distinction.

The consequences of illicit intercourse are so serious to a woman, that none but the most cynically selfish could in cold blood argue in such a manner. The proof of this is, that no man will speak in this way when the woman in question is his own wife, daughter, or sister. But all women are the wives, daughters, or sisters of some one, and as such, men should protect them, even from themselves.

Those of us who desire to see the world better than it is will turn to the young, and will urge them with all the earnestness of which they are capable, "to abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul," whilst yet these lusts are under control, and weak from lack of indulgence; they will appeal to their religious feelings, and point out to them that our Saviour condemned, not only the overt act of sin, but even the impure glance of an eye, for did He not say, "He that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart;" they will endeavour to arouse the chivalrous instinct which is to be found in the heart of most men.

. . . . . .

We are chivalrous when we think about it, but we don't always think about it, and we allow ourselves to do very unchivalrous things from weakness and want of thought. I will tell you a true story which illustrates the Britons' intuitive love of fair play, and is not irrelevant to the subject in hand, as showing the existence of a popular sentiment against kicking a man who is down, which, if properly utilized, might assist the cause of purity, and prevent the further trampling in the mire of a woman already in the gutter.

The historian Kinglake, in his interesting and most graphic account of the battle of Inkerman, tells how a weak battalion of the Guards, whilst defending the Sand-bag battery against overwhelming masses of the Russians, was ordered, as the most effective means of defence, to leap down amongst the enemy and repel them with the bayonet. In obeying the order, each man found himself hemmed in by the Russian soldiery, and it was with the greatest difficulty, owing to the press, that he could use his arms at all. One man named Smith found himself attacked by six or seven Russians at once. He managed to knock down one with the butt-end of his rifle, but when on the ground this man clasped his legs and endeavoured to upset him. Smith, having as much as he could do to defend himself against his other antagonists, endeavoured to release himself from the grasp of the man on the ground by kicking violently. A sergeant of the Guards who was also engaged close by in mortal combat, seeing what was happening, could not refrain from calling out in the midst of his own struggle, "Smith, don't kick a man when he is down!" This is a sentiment, the application of which, though strained in this particular instance, is capable of doing yeoman service if enlisted on the side of purity.

How is a young man who desires to be pure to keep himself from the evil? for it is no easy task he has undertaken.

(1) Let him seek strength from above. Prayer, constant prayer for aid, must be to him both sword and shield.

(2) Let him choose his companions carefully, and as far as possible only consort with the pure-minded. Where choice of companions is impossible, let him firmly but constantly show his distaste of loose conversation. I know this is very difficult to do without giving offence; but it has been done by others, and can be done again; and let the young man remember that Christ Himself has told us that everyone who desires to follow Him must be prepared to meet with a certain amount of persecution and obloquy.

(3) Let him either abstain altogether from spirituous liquors or be strictly temperate.

(4) Let him avoid all entertainments or scenes which he finds by experience excite his passions.

(5) Let him be moderate in his food, and take as much active outdoor exercise as his occupations and his health permit.

(6) Let him avail himself of every opportunity of personal cleanliness, and let him not be afraid of cold fresh water.

It is much easier in these days for a young man of business or a working man to do these things than it used to be in the olden time.

Formerly, churches were tightly locked up from one Sunday to another, and a young man, whose circumstances did not admit of privacy at home, had no place where he could retire and commune with his God; now, in every town of any size, and in many

country villages, there may be found a church which is daily open, and where facilities are given for private prayer. Formerly, a man's choice of companions was limited; now, there are several organizations of young men in existence, formed in connection with the Church, within the ranks of which a decent young fellow may find congenial company. Formerly, it was very difficult for a man to abstain from liquor; now, tee-total and temperance societies abound, and clubs and institutions exist where good-fellowship and entertainment can be obtained, free from temptation to excessive drinking. Formerly, long hours of labour prevailed, and the means of locomotion were beyond the resources of the poor man; now, the working hours of the day have been greatly curtailed in all occupations, and each week has its half or whole holiday in addition to Sunday, on which days multitudes are enabled, by cheap rail and tram fares, and by the use of the cycle, to get healthful and enjoyable exercise in the country.

Parks, gardens, and playgrounds are to be found in towns for those who are unable or do not care to go further afield; and public baths are at the disposal of those who cannot afford to provide such facilities at home.

Man is getting more civilized. The growth of civilization does not necessarily denote any advance in morality, but in some ways, though probably not in all, it makes it easier for a man to do right, and more difficult to do wrong.

Let us, then, take heart of grace, and endeavour by every means in our power to bring up our young men with a higher sense of the value of manly purity, and inspire them with a chivalric desire to protect to the utmost of their power in other men's wives, sisters, and daughters, that female purity which every man, however base or reckless he may be, desires to see possessed by his own wife, sister, or daughter.

> "So dear to heaven is saintly chastity,
> That when a soul is found sincerely so,
> A thousand liveried angels lackey her,
> Driving far off each thing of sin and guilt,
> And in clear dream, and solemn vision,
> Tell her of things that no gross ear can hear,
> Till oft converse with heav'nly habitants
> Begins to cast a beam on th' outward shape,
> The unpolluted temple of the mind,
> And turns it by degrees to the soul's essence,
> Till all be made immortal."

The Rev. HENRY SCOTT-HOLLAND, Canon and Precentor of S. Paul's Cathedral.

MIGHT I just say one word on the literature of the White Cross League which was distributed at the door. That literature is especially adapted to meet those cases which have been referred to in the speeches which have been made to-night. It will be found useful to those who find it difficult to command language to convey the advice to the young which the Bishop urged them to give. Men do find it hard to speak to their own friends; but it is a very easy thing to get a body of solid literature from that society, just to see how the advice can be worded. Then again the White Cross Society exists to prove to those who fear that there are young men who grow up in impurity to the number of hundreds and thousands, feeling themselves a huge army, with the pressure and force of multitudes behind them, moving on one course. I speak it to my shame that I have never been in Norwich before, but this I would say, that I infinitely prefer, instead of addressing my clerical friends, who must be wearied to death of me, to speak to the men of Norwich who are before me. There is something curiously moving in standing before a body of men totally unknown to me, and to whom one is totally unknown, just once in one's life and no more, and to be asked to say to them what is in one's heart. A man at such a time feels like ships that pass in the night; each ship moves out of the night and into the night, and just for a moment the light passes across the water; we hear the cheers perhaps of English voices; we see English faces looking forth in the light, and we hear the answering cry; and again the ships go out into the night, and never meet again. So to-night I stand before you men, and we may never meet again until the Judgment Day. Ah! when it comes, what shall I be glad to have said on this day to the men of Norwich long ago?

There is a voice behind me saying, "Speak now, for you will never speak to them again! Speak to them as you would speak in the light of the Judgment Day!" What shall I speak in the light of the Judgment Day? Well, there is only one thing asked for on the Judgment Day. The one solitary concentrated demand will be for the moral character—the moral stuff of the living man standing there with fixed and established habits, temper, tastes, associations, memories, desires, wants—all these will have been consolidated into a growth which is shaped into the form in which it will stand in the judgment fire for ever. Moral character! That is the only thing asked for; and that moral character is the growth of earth, the result of work here. The one thing which will be asked for on that day will be just the one thing which grew day by day, hour by hour, and minute by minute in the workshop, the home, or at play, in every act; which has grown steadily bit by bit, in the day, and in the night, building up the one personal result which remains with us when all else falls away, and is carried to the Judgment Day. Therefore, that Judgment Day, far from blotting out the significance of our life here on earth, rather brings up life here to the flame of the judgment throne, which takes up every minute detail and every tiny act done in the flesh. It is now that we are building the moral character which will stand then. Moral character! that is the one thing that will be asked. That is the only thing for which life is given us here. Moral character, the moral stuff, the moral life that will become of moral worth—that is the only thing for which we exist—not for dogma or ritual, but solely that the result may be a life of holiness, a life of moral worth, that we may bear on the judgment day that sole test. That is the religious demand, and now let us look all round life as it is here on earth. Let us look at our interests, hopes, and aspirations. Let us look at politics, at economics; let us review for a moment all the responsibilities which are being laid upon us; and, reviewing them, let us ask what is the one thing asked, the one demand made in this life of ours? This great movement of the English democracy for instance; this great advance of labour; this cause of the poor and the weak as well as the strong; all these great movements are creeping upon us like a rising tide. And as we look and watch, we see a splendid adventure, but also an adventure that may be so easily misguided; so little may send it wrong, such pitfalls, such dangers, such snares! And as we watch with anxiety, we ask, how will they make these perilous decisions? What will enable them to form a right judgment? What in the crisis will bring this adventure through to victory? Only one thing, absolutely only one thing—moral character. That is the only thing with which they can go through. Moral worth, moral dignity, moral steadiness, moral judgment, moral might, moral force, that inspires reliance; moral independence, that gives a man steadiness, whether the earth shakes or the hills fall; moral worth, that alone makes the safe leader; and then, moral worth in a leader can only be seen by the moral worth of the men who follow. It is a hard thing to follow leaders; it is a moral act which enables the great mass to trust a strong leader. It lays a hard demand on their loyalty, sincerity, and justice. Only the true man can trust a man to be true. Only the unselfish man can recognize the unselfish leader; only the man of moral independence would allow in the champion moral independence and truth. It is the moral stuff in the leaders, the moral stuff in the men who follow, which alone will carry this great cause to victory. And I ask you here to-night to simply demand moral steadiness in the men who guide you. Moral character! We mean by it a sound will, a life lived for the good of one's brothers, with fixed aims solemnized by serious responsibility. It is stability, the only thing that will go through the test undamaged. Now, I would come, if I might, to the question of purity. We have spoken of purity as a private matter. I propose to speak of it in another light. I do not mean that we should go poking and prying into the domestic affairs of public men; but public men should be judged by public standards. There are those who say that it does not matter to the public services of a man what are the domestic details of his life, whether he is moral or immoral. Do not give in to the view that a man's private life is between himself and his God. It is to combat that idea that I am before you to-night. We are asking for stability of character; and we are asking for it as a national thing on national and industrial grounds. Well, what is the special note of an immoral man? It is *instability* of judgment. He loses the power of steady insight, the power of persistent will. He necessarily becomes feverish and irritable. We ask in our leaders stability above all things. That is a public, a social demand. The immoral man, however gifted and brilliant, will never be a stable man. I would never go to such a man, dear brothers, in the hour of crisis or doubt for a straight, sound, moral judgment. That is the last thing I should ever do. Therefore, I say on public and social grounds,

that we must demand in our leaders moral worth. It is a social demand which I am raising on public grounds. We must ask our leaders and members of Parliament that they shall at least give us evidence that they will stand by us, and that they will not in the time of pressure be the men who will show themselves floored, nervous, unstrung, and who will not be sturdy and secure when we look to them for moral guidance. Therefore, we should so assert our convictions in this matter, that no man with a notorious record of sin shall dare present himself either as a candidate for Parliament or elsewhere. Do you say that is poking and prying? I say it is not. Poking and prying is perilous, and I shall keep out of it by this very rule—that I should make the moral demand so strong that no poking and prying shall be required. If only the demand is publicly acknowledged and certified, then no person who had such a record of sin would dare present himself. The drunkard or the impure man could not say, "I am your man." He would be out of it. To keep up such a moral demand is not poking or prying. But it may be said, "How hypocritical! You come down only on the man whose sin is notorious and open. You shut your eyes to the man who sins in secret." Just so, but I put it in this way. The notoriously bad man challenges me to say that his public services can be divorced from his private character. If I elect the man who sins privately, at the worst I commit a blunder. If I elect the man with a notoriously bad record, I do far worse—I outrage a principle, for I must pronounce that public service is separable from moral character. That is just what is impossible, for character is a matter of the will, and the will is *one* thing always. A man may have conflicting and various passions and desires, but he has only one will. The will is always one in private or in public. It is itself the unity of the man; it is the man himself. You cannot halve that will, and leave the private life on one side and the public life on the other. The will, if it flows in one department, will exhibit that flow in all other sections of the man. I ask you to cling to this eternal verity as a simple social duty. Jesus Christ has told us that the life-force of a man is one, and the spring and source of his actions are one. No man, therefore, can serve two masters; he cannot divide his will into two; he cannot serve his passions by selfish and cruel vice, and also remain in the public service, noble, manly, sincere, and true. Therefore, I ask you to believe that sound, moral judgment and clean living stand together. They have been welded into one nature by the inspiration of Almighty God, who has made man what he is. That being so, it is terrible for us to ignore His purposes. Clean living and sound moral judgment—these have been welded and wedded into one thing by God Himself; and woe be to that man who attempts to put asunder what God has joined together!

The LORD BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE also spoke on Purity, but, by the Bishop's own request, the speech was not reported.

AGRICULTURAL HALL.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 9TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. Bishop BARRY in the Chair.

HOLY SCRIPTURE.

THE AUTHORITY AND CREDIBILITY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS AS AFFECTED BY RECENT DISCOVERIES.

(1) RECENT ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCHES, ESPECIALLY IN EGYPT, PALESTINE, AND CHALDEA.

(2) RECENTLY DISCOVERED MSS.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

OUR meeting to-day is one of exceptional and special interest. Let me remind you that in dealing with the subject of Biblical criticism, it approaches it from a side somewhat different from that on which it is ordinarily viewed. It deals with the authority and credibility of Holy Scripture as they are affected, not by *à priori* criticism, but by actual discovery—archæological and literary. We are, fortunately, in the hands of those who are masters of the subject, and I have great pleasure in the first instance of calling upon Professor Sayce.

The Rev. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Assyriology and Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford.

THE subject on which I have to speak to you is a very large one, and it would need a corresponding length of time for adequate justice to be done to it. I shall therefore restrict myself this morning to a particular section of it, and touch only on the more salient and important facts to which I would draw your attention.

The law, as embodied in the Pentateuch, was the foundation upon which the Jewish Church rested, and the books of the New Testament make it clear that the supernatural origin and Divine character of that Law were accepted by our Lord and His disciples. The tradition and teaching of the Jewish Church were handed on to the Christian Church, and the Pentateuch still retains its place at the beginning and in the forefront of Holy Scripture as the starting point of the special revelation made by God to man. It has been reserved for the end of the nineteenth century to reverse the continuous tradition of the Christian Church, as well as of the Jewish Church—as far back, at all events, as the time when the Samaritans adopted the faith of the Jews—and to make the Law of Moses the last, and not the first stage in the development of Hebrew religion. According to our new teachers, the Law was the result of the decay of prophecy, and of a tendency towards lifeless formalism in religious worship; so that the historical background of Christianity becomes a product of religious decay rather than of

religious growth. This, however, is not the most serious side of the matter. The new teaching involves the belief that considerable portions of the Pentateuch lay claim to an age and authorship which do not belong to them, and that when Hilkiah declared that he had "found the book of the Law" he was intentionally misleading both king and people.

The grounds are twofold upon which this reversal of the tradition of the Church is based. On the one hand it is asserted that literary analysis has shown that the Pentateuch is the work of a number of writers, all of them of comparatively late date, who have combined their several contributions so skilfully as to deceive everyone except a few higher critics at the end of our nineteenth century. On the other hand, it is alleged that as those writers all lived long after the events they profess to record, and as they frequently contradict one another in recording them, the events themselves are unhistorical. And historical criticism is called in to verify this conclusion.

In reading the works of the German critics and their disciples, there is one curious fact which cannot fail to strike us They deal with the literature of the Old Testament as if no other literature had ever existed in the ancient Oriental world, and while professing to regard Old Testament history as merely a part of the general history of mankind, they nevertheless treat it as if the Hebrew people had lived by themselves in a desert island. They are so bent upon detecting microscopic flaws in the Biblical narrative that they can see nothing beyond it. Comparison is the scientific instrument of discovery, and unless the comparison is sufficiently wide, scientific truth is unattainable; but it is only the Biblical text and narratives that our critical friends compare together. Yet mediæval logic would have taught them that no conclusion can be drawn from a "single instance."

And it is no longer with a "single instance" that the unprejudiced student of the Old Testament has to do—thanks to the marvellous development of Oriental archæology. From Egypt, from Babylonia, from Assyria, nay, from Palestine itself, old literatures and inscribed monuments are pouring in, coæval with the age of the patriarchs and of Moses, and offering numberless opportunities for testing the truth and the antiquity of the Biblical record. Take first the question of the literary analysis. That rests in large measure upon the tacit assumption that the Pentateuch *could* not have been written in so early an age as that of Moses. Centuries, it has been argued, had to pass before the Israelites could have employed writing for literary purposes.

Nevertheless, we now know that the Mosaic age in the East was a highly literary one, as literary in fact as the age of the Renaissance in Europe, and that it would have been a miracle if the Israelites, whether in Egypt or in Canaan, had not shared in the general literary culture of the time. I need not now describe at length the discovery in 1887 of the cuneiform tablets of Tel-el-Amarna in Upper Egypt, which have so revolutionized our conceptions of ancient Oriental history. It is sufficient to say that they show that in the century before the Exodus an active correspondence was constantly going on from the banks of the Nile to those of the Euphrates, and that this correspondence was in the foreign language and foreign script of Babylonia, necessitating the existence all over the civilized East of schools and libraries, of teachers

and pupils. They show, moreover, that Canaan was the centre of the correspondence, and of that Babylonian culture which had been carried to it long before by Babylonian conquest, while the libraries of Canaan were stocked with Babylonian literature, which contained not only the traditions and legends of Babylonia, but dictionaries and philological works as well. The Mosaic age illiterate! Why, in Egypt, wherever the Israelite turned, he would have written characters before his eyes. Even the objects that he bought for his toilette were inscribed, and Egyptian literature, which it may be remarked included novels, went back to long ages before Abraham. The antiquity of Babylonian literature was equally great. The chief cities of the country boasted of their libraries, some of which had been founded six thousand years ago, and at the very time when Abraham was born in Ur of the Chaldees, one of its poets was composing a great epic in twelve books, which formed the close of a long preceding period of epic verse. So far as the ancient East is concerned, we cannot too soon rid ourselves of the notion that literature is a modern invention. Moses and his contemporaries lived in the midst of nations who had been writing and reading from time immemorial, and the learning and wisdom, not only of the Egyptians, but of the Babylonians and Canaanites also, could be acquired by any who would. While the rest of the Oriental world was writing and reading, teaching and learning, we cannot suppose that the Israelites alone were asleep.

Moses, then, *could* have written the Pentateuch, and those to whom it is addressed *could* have read and understood it. Has the so-called literary analysis of the critics proved that he did not? A sufficient answer to this question might be found in the fact that the final result of the analysis is a *reductio ad absurdum*. The beginning of a verse is assigned to one author, the middle of it to another, and the end of it to a third, while a European scholar at the end of the nineteenth century affects to distinguish and separate them one from another. Such a feat would be impossible, even in the case of English literature; how much more impossible must it be where the critic is not even a modern Oriental, with the ideas and ways of the East familiar to him from childhood, and where the language of the literature is very imperfectly known! The books of the Old Testament are but a fragment of the Hebrew literature which once existed, and even apart from possible corruptions of the text, the meaning of numerous Hebrew words and grammatical constructions is merely a matter of conjecture. The Assyrian monuments have already proved helpful in determining the signification of Hebrew words, and they have proved still more helpful in another way. They have shown that the Semitic peoples of the East did not compile their works as the critics would have us believe. Many of them were doubtless compilations in which older materials were freely made use of, and incorporated with little or no change of language, but each work had its own author who preserved his own individuality, and whose name, like that of the author of the great Babylonian epic, was handed down to posterity. There was no slicing and fitting together of tiny morsels of earlier literature, as in a Chinese puzzle; no literary mosaic-work such as we are told is the case in the Pentateuch. If older materials were embodied, they were introduced as a modern writer would introduce a passage from another author, and it is through their contents and not

through their linguistic peculiarites that we are—or can be—made aware of their introduction.

In most cases, at all events where history is concerned, the older materials were thrown into shape by the author who employed them. It is only now and then that he quotes the precise words of the earlier writer from whom he derived his narrative. This brings us to the second contention of the newer criticism: that the narratives of the Pentateuch are unhistorical, and derived for the most part from popular legend. Against this contention, Oriental archæology is raising a constantly growing body of counter evidence. Contemporaneous documents are continually being discovered which prove that the discredited statements of Genesis are, after all, true and historical. Take, for example, the account of the campaign of Chedorlaomer and his Babylonian allies against the Canaanites. We now know that long before the age of Abraham the Babylonian kings had led their armies to Canaan, and that for many centuries the government and civilization of Babylonia had been dominant there. Less than a century after Chedorlaomer's campaign, a Babylonian monarch still calls himself king of the land of the Amorites, or Palestine, and Professor Hommel has just pointed out a text which describes the capture of Zemar in Phœnicia (Genesis x. 18) by a king of Ur who reigned several centuries previously. In the name of the Elamite King of Larsa, Eri-Aku, Assyriologists have long seen that of Arioch of Ellasar, and Eri-Aku describes his father Kudur-Mabug as the "father of Western Syria." Now, Mr. Pinches, to whom Biblical and historical students are so much indebted, has discovered a broken tablet in which this same Eri-Aku is associated with two other princes, Kudur-Lagamar or Chedorlaomer the Elamite, and Tudkhal, the Tidal of Genesis. The proof of the historical accuracy of the narrative in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis is thus complete.

But a discovery, still more important for establishing the truth and authenticity of the historical sources of Genesis, has also lately been made by Mr. Pinches, who has allowed me to make it known for the first time on the present occasion. Before doing so, however, a few preliminary remarks are necessary. Arioch, or Eri-Aku, to whom I have just been alluding, was overthrown, along with his Elamite allies, by Khammurabi, the rival king of Babylon, and his kingdom annexed to that of his conqueror. Henceforth, Babylonia, which had previously been divided into more than one kingdom, became a united monarchy, with Babylon as its capital. Now the names of the kings of the dynasty to which Khammurabi belonged are not Babylonian, or, as we generally term it, Assyrian, the words with which they are compounded not being found for the most part in that language. The Babylonians consequently found a difficulty in spelling them, and in the contract tablets which were drawn up at the time, the same name is written in different ways. Five years ago I pointed out that the dynasty must have come from South Arabia, or have been connected with South Arabia, since similar names are met with in the early inscriptions of that part of the Semitic world. Since then I have further pointed out that the names also offer curious resemblances to Hebrew names, and that the words of which they are composed belong quite as much to the lexicon of Canaan as to that of South Arabia. On the top of this comes Mr. Pinches' discovery. Among other names which remind us of those of the Old Testament, he

has found in contract tablets dated in the reigns of Khammurabi and other kings of the dynasty, the names of Yakub-ili and Yasup-ili, or Jacob-el and Joseph-el. The names are distinctively Hebrew, and prove that in the very century to which the Bible assigns the lifetime of Abraham, Hebrews with Hebrew names must have been living in Babylonia. The Egyptian monuments of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties mention places in Palestine called Jacob-el and Joseph-el, so that it has long been assumed that in the familiar Jacob and Joseph we must see an abbreviation of Jacob-el and Joseph-el, and last year Prof. Flinders Petrie actually found a scarab bearing the name of a Pharaoh, Jacob-el, who must have reigned over Egypt in the obscure period when it was ruled by Asiatic conquerors. As for the name of Abram, that has already been noted in Babylonian contracts of the time of Arioch.

But you will observe that the discovery of the names of Jacob-el and Joseph-el does more than prove the presence of Hebrews in Babylonia in the days of Abraham. It proves also that I was right in believing that the Babylonian kings under whom Abraham was born were related in language and race, not only to South Arabia, but to the Hebrews as well. In other words, the Hebrews and the tribes of Southern Arabia must have had a common ancestor, and their common meeting point was in Babylonia. Now turn to the tenth chapter of Genesis. There we read that "unto Eber were born two sons; the name of one was Peleg," the ancestor of "Abram the Hebrew;" the name of the other was Joktan, the ancestor of the tribes of Southern Arabia. Could any better verification be needed of the truthfulness of an account which even conservative critics have been accustomed to look upon as referring, not to individuals, but to tribal relations? Or could we wish for any stronger confirmation of the statement that Abraham himself was born in "Ur of the Chaldees?"

With this latest and most striking testimony from monuments which are acknowledged to be contemporaneous with the events they record, I must bring to an end this very imperfect paper. I cannot now do more than touch upon the statements scattered here and there through the Pentateuch, which archæological research forbids us from dating later than the Mosaic age. At no later time, for instance, would it have been possible for a writer to assert that Canaan was the brother of Mizraim, or Egypt, as we find recorded in the tenth chapter of Genesis. With the fall of the nineteenth Egyptian dynasty, Canaan ceased to be a province of the Pharaohs. But these are matters which cannot be treated in a paper like the present. All that this can do is to sketch the general outlines of the answer which the monuments of the ancient Oriental world are giving to the boasted "results" of an over-hasty and one-sided criticism.

THEO. G. PINCHES, Esq., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum.

I TAKE it to be a good sign that Church Congresses pay attention to the discoveries which are constantly being made in Assyriology and Egyptology, for so much has been written of late upon those sciences,

in connection with the Bible, that no Churchman—indeed, no Christian—can afford to be ignorant of the results of the researches; moreover, it is impossible to say how far-reaching these discoveries may be in their ultimate bearing.

We have now come to a period when what are apparently the originals of the stories of the beginning of the world, as detailed in the book of Genesis, force themselves upon our notice. Various scholars, notably Sayce, Delitzsch, Haupt, Hommel, and Jensen, have treated of them, and I myself have spoken of the creation legends in my address before the Church Congress held at Rhyl, and elsewhere. In the stories of the creation I found but little which could be regarded as having been copied or adapted from the Babylonian accounts, and I have not since that time had any reason to change my opinion.

Taking the question of the position of Paradise, as distinct from that of the story of the creation, notwithstanding all that has been written, much remains that is doubtful. Sayce has made the excellent suggestion that we ought to read Assur the city, rather than Assyria the country, to the east of which the Hiddekel flowed, and that is a gain—but how about the Pison and the Gihon? There is no disguising the fact that these two streams find no parallel in the literature of Assyria and Babylonia, notwithstanding the ingenious and interesting conjectures that have been made. Delitzsch's *pisannu* still remains unfound as the name of a river, and more than one philological consideration militates against his identification of the Gihon with the Akkadian Guhandê. Future discoveries will, no doubt, reveal them.

Time, however, seems to have proved that Delitzsch's location of Paradise in Babylonia is the correct one. The word for "plain" or "country" was Edina or Eden, and one of the Sipparas was called Sipar of Edina, as we learn from a small fragment of a Babylonian tablet acquired by Dr. Hayes Ward in 1885, thus supporting Delitzsch's theory. The Tigris and the Euphrates are well-known streams, and present no difficulty. Some of the countries mentioned are, however, hard to identify, and may be regarded as having been assimilated with more or less success. These I pass over, referring my audience to the works of Sayce, Delitzsch, Haupt, and others, and come to the main point, the Garden of Eden itself.

Eden seems to have been well proved to be an Akkadian name, applied to a portion, if not the whole, of Babylonia, but the Babylonian inscriptions have as yet not furnished us with a "garden of Eden"—*gannat mât Edinni*. We shall possibly find it after further excavations have been made. A paradise, however—a holy abode—which was not for man, is spoken of, and as I have lately found an addition to the text, supplementing Professor Sayce's and my own earlier renderings, I have chosen it as one of the points to be mentioned here. At a time when the Persian gulf extended much farther inland than now, there lay upon its shores a city called Eridu, a word derived from the Sumerian Eri-siba or the Akkadian Guru-duga, "the good city." This city is described as itself being, or as containing, "a dark vine," growing in a glorious place, its form bright lapis-stone, set in the abyss. Eridu is said to be a place which the path of Ea (the god of rivers, streams, etc.) filled with fulness of fertility, the seat of the central place of the earth, on whose shore was the bed of Nammu (the river-god). No man

entered the interior of that glorious house, to which the shade of the forest-like vine extended, for there was the home of Tammuz—Tammuz of the Abyss—"between the mouths of the rivers (which are) on each side." Such is the substance of this text, as far as it has been preserved to us, and it formed the introduction to an incantation, couched in an exceedingly poetical form, which was a great favourite with the Babylonians, at least during the later period. We have here a mystic paradise, lost, as was that of the Hebrews. The city remained, or a part of it, or another of the same name was built, but its "glorious vine," the type of the tree of knowledge, was no more. Though its glory had departed, the legend referring to it remains, and the Babylonians imagined it as still existing, with its tree, like unto bright lapis-stone, growing in a glorious place, the abode of the sun god Tammuz of the abyss (probably typifying the sun after he had set), lying at the mouths of the rivers—possibly that place to which the Chaldean Noah, Umnapistim, "the day" or "light of life," had been translated, where the hero Gilgames had sought him, to know how he had gained the gift of deathless life, and to be cured of the disease from which he himself was suffering, as the flood-legend tells us.

But there is another tablet, the importance of which Professor Sayce was the first to bring to our notice. This text speaks of "the cedar beloved of the great gods," and possibly gave rise to the numerous representations of the sacred tree. This document, however, is apparently not one of the series of "Creation-tablets," and therefore only proves that divine trees—probably in this case a "tree of life," as that of Eridu seems to have been to a certain extent a "tree of knowledge"—played a great part in the religion of the Babylonians, and thus furnish points of contact with the religion of the Hebrews, and indicate the possible source of the Biblical account of the creation.

An important point which has of late forced itself upon my notice is the divine names, Jah and Jehovah, and as a result of my studies, I am able to state that the name Jah (Yâ) as the name of God was not only known to the Hebrews, but also to most of the Semites of Western Asia, including the Babylonians and Assyrians. What modifications in the history of the religion of the ancient East (the Semitic East) this may make we do not know, and we must patiently wait for more light. Of a like importance is the question of the origin of the name Jehovah. As we know, this name is incorrectly read for an earlier form, long lost, containing the same consonants. The true reading I am now able to announce as Jahwah (Yahwah), and all the indications are in favour of the correctness of the statements in Exodus that God was not known to the ancestors of the Jewish nation by the name of Jehovah (*i.e.*, Jahwah) before the date to which that book refers. The names found in the Babylonian inscriptions of the time of the captivity compounded with *yâwa* show that no objection to pronouncing this sacred name existed then, whatever may have been the usage at a later date.

As will naturally be seen, the unmistakably Jewish names containing the element Yâwa, to which I have made reference above, are direct and contemporaneous confirmations of the historical fact of the captivity of the Jews at Babylon. It is worthy of note that the transportation of a whole nation to another district was not by any means an uncommon thing, for it had already been done by Sargon, Sennacherib, and

Assur-banî-apli. The earliest instance is probably that of the transportation of the Sutî "from east to west" (*i.e.*, to Phœnicia), by Kuri-galzu, king of Babylon, about 1400 B.C. These transportations were managed by sending the people in sections (bands or troops), of such a size and at such times as were convenient.

What connection there may be between the names of Yâ (Jah) and Ninip, which latter is the deity with whom the god of Jerusalem was identified before the entry of the Jews into the Holy Land, we do not know; but there are indications which seem to point to the fact that the name Ninip, the Semitic pronunciation of which is not given in Assyrian inscriptions, was Yâ. This is supported by the two terms, *rabâ-sa-Ninip* and *banâ-sa-ya*, apparently the titles of two classes of priests of Ninip and Yâ, and the name of the priest of Ninip at Calah during the time of Assur-banî-apli was called Nadinaya, a name which contains the same syllable. Then, again, Jahwah of Israel was "the Lord of Hosts," "a man of war," a parallel to Ninip, "the warrior," "the god of battle."

There is, apparently, a considerable amount of mystery connected with the worship of Ninip, the god of Salem, by the Assyrians, exhibited to a certain extent in the royal names, Tukulti-Ninip, Ninip-tuklat-Assur, and the three Tiglath-pilesers (this last name, in Assyrian, is Tukulti-âpil-E-sara, a synonym of Tukulti-Ninip). It is, therefore, not impossible that Ahaz (2 Kings xvi.) may have been induced to become a vassal of the Assyrian king, Tiglath-pileser III., by the consideration that one who bore, as part of his name, one of the titles of the god of Salem of old, could hardly be such a heathen as he was painted.

Be this as it may, however, one of the most interesting parallels to a very interesting episode in Jewish history is presented by the text which gives the name of the priest of Ninip at Calah, mentioned above. In this important inscription a captain of Assur-banî-apli's army, in his loyal zeal, dedicates his son to the god Ninip, for the preservation of the life of Assur-banî-apli, his king. This is couched in the form of a contract of a most solemn nature, witnessed by the priests and chief men of Calah, and sealed with four impressions of the seal of the father. This text recalls the dedication of Samuel to the service of the Lord by his mother. The parallelism lies, in this case, simply in the dedication to the god, the motives being different, for whilst Samuel seems to have been dedicated as a kind of thank-offering, the son of Assur-banî-apli's captain seems to have been dedicated to the god before the benefit desired (which also differed) was granted. References to the dedication of human beings to deities have also been found in Babylonia, and in one case it is a mother, who, however, seems to apply to the priests of the temple to grant a postponement of the evil day when she was to be separated from her sons (three in number)—a postponement which was only effected by the offering of a gift, notwithstanding her plea that they were still too young. It was, therefore, a great sacrifice on the part of Samuel's mother to part with her son at such an early age—a sacrifice which was, probably, notwithstanding her vow, by no means obligatory.

A remarkable tablet, unfortunately extremely mutilated, came to light last year, and with great pains I succeeded in getting from it a certain amount of information, though the tale it has to tell is exceedingly

fragmentary. It makes reference to a personage named Eri-Eaku, seemingly the Arioch of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis (a name which, however, is found in other inscriptions under the form of Eri-Aku), together with Tud-khula, son of Gazza-* * , apparently the Tidal "King of Nations" of the same chapter, and a name which seems to be that of Chedorlaomer, namely, Kudur(laga)mal. The historical events mentioned by this text refer to Dûr-mag-îlâni, Babylon, the temple E-saggil, Elam, the land of Rabbâtum, and Akkad. None of these names refer to the neighbourhood of Sodom and Gomorrah, with the single doubtful exception of Rabbâtum, which may be a place named Rabboth. One of the historical facts recorded seems to be that Chedorlaomer (?) killed his son "with the iron sword of his girdle." Such a text as this naturally makes one hopeful that something bearing upon these kings may be found in Babylonia, perhaps a perfect copy of the inscription I now bring to your notice.

Though the chronological difficulties of Assyrian and Israelitish history remain, we are getting gradually further proofs that the historical comparisons made are correct. One of the most important of these is in connection with the name of Ben-Hadad. My discovery, some years ago, of a name which could be read Bin-Addu, or Abil-Addu (which I afterwards found to have been vulgarly pronounced Ablada), meaning "the son of Hadad," or "of Rimmon," caused a change in the reading of the name identified with Ben-Hadad, in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser II., from Rammânu-idri to Addu-idri, an abbreviation of Bin-Addu-idri, or Ben-Hadad-idri, shortened by the Hebrews to Ben-Hadad. This, of course, was a distinct gain, for we have only to suppose the explanation "the son of Hadad" in the Hebrew to be a late addition, made by a scribe who did not know the contemporary history of the time (a thing that is not only possible, but extremely probable), to obtain a perfect agreement in the two accounts.

The Babylonian chronicle, which tells of the murder of Sennacherib by one of his sons, with the chronological list referring to the same period, sets at rest the question as to whether Pul and Tiglath-pileser III. were one and the same, enabling us to answer in the affirmative. The most probable reason for his bearing the two names is, that the Babylonian scribes gave him the derisive name of Pulu, "the wild animal," just as they called Shalmaneser IV. Ululâa, "he of the month Elul," and as, possibly, Assur-banî-apli, "the great and noble Asnaper," was called Kandalanu.†

Finally, I have a few words to say anent my translation of the part of the Babylonian Chronicle referring to the capture of Babylon, and in this I may say that I have not seen the least necessity to depart from the rendering which I proposed in my address delivered before the Rhyl Church Congress, and since repeated, more circumstantially, in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible." The reason of my doing this is, that a German Assyriologist unintentionally attributed to me other views, namely, that I read "the wife of the king died," instead of "the son of

† This, however, is doubtful, as, judging from the fact that contracts are found dated in the reign of Kandalanu, he ought to be a different person from Assur-bani-apli. No contracts have, as far as I know, been found dated in the reigns of Pulu or Pul, and Ululâa, these kings being called, officially, Tiglath-pileser and Shalmaneser.

the king died," a statement which, in that place, would be, to say the least of it, unexpected. The translation which I adopted some years ago, and which I do not as yet see any reason to abandon, is "On the night of the eleventh of Marcheswan Gobryas [descended] against [Babylon], and the son of the king died." Two words are here restored, namely, "descended," and "Babylon," but as there is hardly any doubt that these or similar expressions stood in the original when it was in a complete state, and as the sense seems to demand some such completion, this restoration can hardly be regarded as unreasonable. Sayce restores this passage, "Gobryas (was) on [the bank of the river]," apparently referring to the fact that the city was taken by draining the river bed. In whatever way the lacuna is to be filled up, however, one thing is certain, and that is, that on the *night* of the 11th of Marcheswan Gobryas did something "against" or "upon" some place, and some royal personage died. As this event took place in "the night," it is not going too far to say that it probably refers to the event narrated in Daniel, which tells us that Belshazzar, king of the Chaldeans, was slain in the night, after he had held a high festival, and Darius the Mede, a man of advanced age, received the kingdom. According to the Greek authors, Nabonidus, father of Belshazzar, surrendered to the army of Cyrus, who gave him a habitation in Carmania, where he died. Nabonidus, by his surrender, may be regarded as having abdicated, and his son would then have become, by his birthright, king. It therefore does not matter whether we read (as I did on first translating the tablet in 1880) "the king died," or (as I now propose) "the son of the king died;" Belshazzar would, in either case, be meant. The Hebrew scribe, however, not knowing who Gobryas was, has substituted for this name that of the better-known Darius, quite ignoring the fact that he was of a different nationality, a later date, and a much younger man. It is to be noted that the contract-tablets point to the 11th of Marcheswan as the date when the Babylonian empire ceased to exist, and the country yielded up its independence into the hands of the Persian conqueror.

This improved translation pre-supposes that Belshazzar was holding out in some part of Babylon, and, if it be the right rendering, shows that Daniel (v. 30) is substantially correct, but it does not rehabilitate the other portions of the book. Darius the Mede is mentioned again in chapters ix. and xi. (first year in both cases, which is noteworthy), and the third year of Belshazzar in chapter viii. If Darius the Mede be Gobryas, we may safely say that he never reigned, though he seems for a time to have exercised the functions of a king, appointing governors, etc. Belshazzar's reign, however, was too short and too troublous to allow of contracts being made in it, so that, so far from having his third year (as is mentioned in Daniel viii.), we have not even his first mentioned in the large number of contract-tablets brought from Babylonia—in fact, he probably never reigned in the true sense of the word.

ADDRESS.

(1) Recent Archæological Researches, especially in Egypt, Palestine, and Chaldea.

Sir Charles Warren, K.C.B.

When I was asked to speak on this subject, it seemed to me one that might be touched on without difficulty, as I knew of no discoveries which could in any way serve to detract from the authority of Scriptures; and, on the other hand, every discovery I knew of, either acted as negative confirmation, or else strengthened the evidence in favour. But I had always thought of discoveries as elucidating the Scriptures, and when I proceded to attempt to think out the extent to which recent discoveries have influenced the credibility of the Bible, I found myself confronted with a grave difficulty which seems insoluble.

There are no means of investigating the foundations on which the credibility and authority of the Scriptures rest, and apportioning the amount due to historical, geographical, archæological, or corroborative proofs: or, even if this is assumed, there are no means of readily calculating the extent to which these proofs may be affected by recent discoveries; neither are there any means of ascertaining to what extent individuals may be affected by the said discoveries. Some are not influenced in the least by historical and geographical evidence, while others attach all importance to it. Some pay no attention to recent discoveries, while others are subject to their influence from day to day.

The weight to be attached by each individual to the credibility of the Scriptures is arrived at by a variety of methods, and can be gauged by no logical deductions. Each arrives at his conclusions by a different route.

Each man has to prove the fact for himself. No one can possibly say, therefore, to what extent recent discoveries affect the credibility of Scriptures, whose value is governed according to a different standard by every individual mind. We possess various concurrent histories of the portion of the world whence the Scriptures emanated. We have the ruins of the ancient sites, the languages and site names still existing; more important still, we have the traditions, legends, manners, and customs of the people inhabiting those countries. All these together have contributed in times past to corroborate the Scriptures, but they do no more than that; and to my mind no discoveries, however important, can have any appreciable effect on the mass of evidence that already exists, though they may be of the highest importance in elucidating the Bible.

Some may be intensely interested in the finding of a brick tablet, an old ruin or name, but this will not build up faith, though it may stimulate the mind to think.

The importance of discoveries I take, therefore, to have nothing to do with affecting the credibility of Scriptures, or with influencing those who do not believe. I think that the results of discoveries are limited to increasing the knowledge and confirming the faith of those who believe.

Now, having summarily disposed of my subject, I propose to devote my time to pointing out discoveries that tend to confirm our faith; but first I have to say a word or two on the advantage of controversy and dispute to those who are still in doubt. Discoveries set matters at rest, and in doing so increase the value of Scriptures to some inappreciable extent, but at the same time they remove all the interest which gathers round a disputed point, and leave nothing to be discussed or commented on. This I take to be a terrible drawback, because it is by controversy and dispute on

scriptural subjects that so many minds are first led to take an interest in the land, and eventually arrive at a faith in the book. Fortunately, discoveries, as a rule, only partially set questions at rest—fresh questions arising which have still to be solved.

Nevertheless it was imperatively necessary to make researches so as to try and elucidate the Bible, while there was time, as so much evidence, profusely scattered over the land, owing to the manners and customs having remained unchanged for so many centuries, was on the point of vanishing on account of the rapid march of civilization through the country. The object of the Palestine Exploration Fund was to elucidate the Bible; it commenced its operations in 1865, and has for thirty years carried on a stupendous work in Palestine, the results of which have thoroughly justified its existence: work which but for its establishment might not have been undertaken until it was too late.

I propose to touch on a few points this morning in relation to discoveries, but nothing I can allude to can in any way bring before you the result of the labours of the Palestine Exploration Fund and of private individuals during the last thirty years. I first want to refer to the land of Goshen, which ought to be found somewhere to the north-east of Egypt, but in place of which now only is found a sandy desert, excepting a small portion near the modern town of Ismailia.

During my sojourn in Philistia I visited the country about Ascalon, which was known in early days to have been a very fertile tract, though now a sandy desert incapable of supporting vegetable life, because its sands shift before vegetation has time to grow. As I travelled over the sandy dunes I was much surprised to come across a hollow, or crater, in the sand some twenty to thirty feet deep, at the bottom of which were some fig trees, then another hole with apple trees, and so on till I came to a larger hole, where was a house and patch of garden ground. All this was below the level of the tops of the sand hills, so that at a short distance not a sign of any vegetation could be seen. On enquiry as to the origin of this curious system, I ascertained that the owners of the property had been brought up on it, and had been engaged all their lives in fighting with the moving sands, gathering up the sands which fall on the sea side, and carrying them up to the top of the off side, to be carried on by the wind. In all probability this had been going on for centuries all over this country, and the few farms left at the bottom of these craters are the remnants of the fair fields of Ascalon, soon to disappear, as the sand mounts higher and higher above the original level of the land. This movement of the sand is due to the winds prevailing from a certain quarter—the south-west. The sands are driven forward; at first they are in lines of billows or waves a few inches apart from crest to crest; as the sand increases in depth the waves rise higher and higher, the crests being further and further apart, until at last they appear of huge proportions, sometimes thirty to forty feet high. But whatever may be the height, the method of progression is the same—a slope of about ten degrees, up which the sands are driven by the wind, and a fall of about thirty to thirty-eight degrees, down which the sands fall of their own weight, thence from the bottom again to mount a slope of ten degrees. In one part of the desert where telegraph posts have been erected on the crests of the sand dunes, I saw a few months afterwards the posts hanging by the wires in the air, the crests having moved on while the posts remained behind.

In the summer of 1882, when on the Palmer Search Expedition, I had occasion to take a long journey over a trackless desert of sand dunes for over three days without water, and arrived, after much suffering on the part of the Bedouins, who did not belong to that part, at a remarkable crater in the sand dunes some three hundred feet to four hundred feet deep, at the bottom of which was a well of water called Mahada, not many miles from Ismailia. Now here I found going on, on a large scale, exactly

what I have described on a small scale at Ascalon. A number of men were busily engaged in carrying the sand which rolled down towards the well up again, and depositing it on the opposite side. The well was built in the red soil of the country, and it was evident that the whole surrounding country had been submerged by these mountains of sand, some three hundred feet to four hundred feet in height. Here, then, was a solution to the question of the position of the land of Goshen. This well is probably the last surviving feature of the fertile country which existed over three thousand years ago, and which is now, owing to the constant movement of the rolling sands, a trackless wilderness, and which, but for the evidence obtainable at Ascalon, and this one surviving feature, might never have been known to be the natural and original feature of the land during early historical times.

I bring this forward as one of those testimonies to the truth of the scriptural accounts which, though small in themselves, yet, when taken together, are of very great value.

The question as to the overwhelming of the Egyptians in the Red Sea by the waters which had been driven away by an east wind to allow the Israelites to pass through, is one which has received many explanations, but which seems to be explained by the very simplest phenomenon, to which I will allude.

In 1876, when I was laying out the line of demarcation between the Orange Free State and Griqualand West, I was measuring a base line in the bed of a lake or pan which was absolutely flat for over t wo miles, so that a small amount of water in it was heaped up at either end, according to the direction of the wind, while the centre was dry. This is what I wrote on the subject in 1879 :—

"The dead level of the pan bed may be known by the fact that after a thunder-storm the water lies on the bed in one long unbroken sheet during calm weather at a uniform depth ; but when the wind blows strongly and continuously, the water is blown over to the leeward side and heaped up there ; so much so, that should there be a sudden change of wind, the water will be driven in a wave from one side to the other, the dry portion being in a short time covered up to a depth of one or two feet, while what was covered with water is now left dry."

Again, in the North Sea or German Ocean, it will be observed that the banks of Holland are high while those of England opposite are scarcely above high water mark, the reason being that when there is a westerly gale the water blown up channel is heaped up against the banks of Holland, but when there is an easterly gale the water is driven out of the North Sea, and though there is a high sea the line of the water on our shores is lowered.

Even in the Red Sea itself, to the present day, the same phenomenon is noticeable, for during the months the wind is up the Gulf the water is heaped up towards the Suez end and flows towards the Atlantic, but when the wind changes the sea is lowered four feet, and the coral reefs are exposed.

It can, then, be readily understood from these examples, that, with an arm of the sea at a bend, a strong wind could force the water away so as to leave dry land for a passage, while a change of wind would heap the water up high at the same point.

I allude to a small point, but one of some importance, as to the position of Kadesh Barnea and the grapes of Eshcol. In the Negeb, or low country, are lines on the hill sides and valleys covered over with stone heaps, the remains of grape vine terraces, which still retain the name in Arabia of grape mounds. These were discovered by Professor Palmer during his wanderings in the desert of the Tih, and thus the question of the existence of grapes where there is now only a stony desert is set at rest.

Again, let me call attention to the desert itself, as so much has been said as to the impossibility of sustaining the multitude of the Israelites for so long a time in a desert.

It was a desert in comparison with the rich country about Egypt, which is so fertile that it supports as large a population per mile as we have in Yorkshire with our populous manufacturing towns living on food brought from abroad. The people of Egypt can not only support themselves, but they can export food.

Professor Palmer states: "Half the desert owes its existence to the Bedouin, and many a fertile plain, from which he has driven its useful and industrious inhabitants, became in his hands like the south country, a parched and barren wilderness." But the south country itself is not a real desert, it is only an artificial desert.

The desert of the Tih is the real desert—the desert of the wanderings—but it is only a desert by comparison; the only natural desert is that of rolling sands, already described, which probably did not exist at the time of the Israelites. The rainfall is roughly estimated at twelve inches per annum, which appears to be considerably in excess of many of the pasture lands of South Africa. In fact a great proportion of the desert proper only differs in degree from the sheep farms of South Africa. It will always remain, more or less, a desert for part of the year, but it is a desert which might with advantage be inhabited by farmers with settled homes. There are springs in many parts, and fresh water near the surface over a stretch of many square miles. There are goats and many sheep in the desert at the present time. In the spring there is grass and water everywhere, but in the summer and autumn the Bedouins congregate near the springs and palm groves. In the winter they are in great straits, because the water is often twenty miles from the grass, and the flocks are continually on the move from one to the other. The Bedouins have their cultivated lands where they grow corn. On the summit of Mount Raha, near Suez, on a mountain which looked from below like a howling wilderness, I found corn lands, because there the soil is fertile, and the sea breezes charged with moisture deposit water in the form of rain or mist on these high lands early in the morning.

In the Peninsula of Sinai there is still greater fertility, and it seems only to have become a desert in very recent times—since the tax on the Bedouin was turned into charcoal, which led to the cutting down of the trees. In the valleys still can be seen the corn magazines and watch houses and remains of cultivated grounds.

With a settled and careful government, trees and cultivation would again flourish in the Sinai Peninsula. It is plain from a residence in Arabia Petræa that it is now far more of a desert than it was in early days, and would then have supported a fairly large population.

Tel el Hessey.—This is a mound near Gaza, and by some is identified as Lakish. I do not think that it is necessary to insist on this identification in order to assert the importance of the discovery. Whether Lakish or not, it is a mound of many cities, going back to the remotest time—time when Egypt exercised a great influence in this part of the world, and as such it serves to corroborate our Biblical history. To my mind, the great value of the history of these excavations is the wonderful view we have there of the admirable manner in which the work of exploration was carried out by Mr. Flinders Petrie, and afterwards by Dr. Bliss; and we may be assured from this account how carefully the work in Palestine is being done.

The account of the excavations here appeals to our reasoning faculties in a remarkable manner, showing what records there must be in Palestine still untouched, and what may be brought forward any day.

Identification of Names and Sites.—One of the enormous gains to the study of the Bible due to the exertions of the Palestine Exploration Fund is the recovery of a very large proportion of the Biblical names. At the beginning of this century almost the only map of Palestine was one made from the Bible, having no connection with

actual realities. Then came a map of Palestine showing the native names, which seemed for the great part to have nothing in common with the names in the Bible. Of the 622 Biblical names, about 260 had been located by Robinson, Smith, and others when the Palestine Exploration Fund came into the field. As a result of the Palestine Survey, 172 more names were recovered, making 332 in all, leaving still 188 places to locate, but these are for the most part small and insignificant. Nearly every place of much importance has been identified. This Survey was just done in time, as in consequence of the march of civilization ruins are disappearing, and people are fast losing their memory of the past; and as they have now arts and sciences, their traditions and customs are vanishing. The Survey has thus enabled the student to study the Bible geographically in a manner that was impossible before.

Moabite Stone.—The discoveries most calculated to interest persons are those of inscribed and carved stones; and of these the most interesting, not only on account of the sensational character of its partial destruction, but also on account of its extraordinary importance, is the Moabite Stone. This was a piece of cut black basalt found in Dhiban, in the land of Moab, in the year 1868, after it had been hidden away for thousands of years. It is not intended here to allude to its destruction further than to say that probably the mutilated condition of the stone caused such an intensity of interest in it that more has been learnt from it than if it had been whole. I do not doubt myself that the Biblical gains were very much enhanced by its destruction. The inscription is of the greatest value from a variety of points of view. In the first place, it is a contemporaneous account of events related in the Old Testament of the time of Omri and Ahab, written by the Moabite King Mesa mentioned in the Bible, and the discrepancies are just those that would arise from the Hebrew and Moabite origins of the different accounts. This in itself is a most wonderful testimony to the verity of the historical books, to all those who might be inclined to think that they are not chronicles of events that have actually happened. This has been described as being like another page added to the Bible; it has so many values, historical, geographic, linguistic, theological, and palæographic. The date of the stone is about 900 B.C., and it is supposed to have been engraved in the second year of Ahaz, King of Israel. The characters are supposed to be the same as those used by King David and Solomon. The most interesting point about the characters is their simplicity; they are very similar to the Archaic Greek characters, and are very like those in use at the present day.

The Inscribed Stone of the Temple.—This is an important discovery, as it is one of the actual boundary stones in the Temple of Herod forbidding strangers to pass the sacred enclosure, the prohibition being written in Latin and Greek. The account of this is given in the works of Josephus. This has an important bearing on the Bible in the way that Josephus describes the Temple of Herod, and this discovery goes to corroborate his account. There is an episode in the Acts of the Apostles (xxi. 26) which throws light upon this inscription.

The Inscription, Pool of Siloam.—This is a Phœnician inscription cut on the rocks, supposed to be of the time of King Hezekiah. It refers to the cutting of the aqueduct, one of the water-works mentioned in the historical books as belonging to the time of that king. Among other interesting points are those of the remarkable rock tombs about Jerusalem, and Mr. Flinders Petrie in an article in the Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly deduces from their measurements the length of the various cubits:—

Phœnician cubits	...	...	...	..	22·6 inches.
Egyptian ,,	...	...	...	...	20·57 ,,
Old Jewish ,,	...	...	...	...	25·2 ,,

and shows that in the later ages, such as Greek and Roman times, the Egyptian and Phœnician measures predominated.

The Waters of Jerusalem.—From year to year during the last thirty years fresh knowledge has been gained of the extraordinary system of aqueducts which traverse the ancient city, and now there is a good plan of the whole. Constant reference is made in the Bible to these waters, and to the works which were constructed by the various kings, especially to those of King Hezekiah. Water was not only brought into the Holy City from long distances by aqueducts at great expense, but there was an elaborate system of aqueducts in the city itself, by which its hidden waters were carried about from the sealed fountain, so that during a siege the inhabitants were supplied with water for a long time. It seemed very uncertain how this could have been done. But now miles of aqueducts have been laid bare, and the manner in which the people were enabled to get water without going outside the gates is known. Now we know the meaning of the passage (2 Chronicles xxiii.) about the water being brought into Jerusalem, and the Assyrians having no water. Along one street running outside the Temple in the time of King Herod there was a pavement, and at intervals of a few feet there were stone openings through which buckets could be let down into the aqueduct, and water brought up. There is every indication that there was much water, and that this water was drawn from springs close to the city and brought in by aqueducts which an enemy could not find, so that there would be plenty of water inside.

Jerusalem—Its Walls and Palaces.—Owing to the poetical works of the Bible a charm hangs over Jerusalem, and one is ever ready to recur to the subject with fresh interest. No very striking discoveries have been made here within the last few years, but work is steadily going on under Dr. Bliss, and insensibly we year by year obtain a better idea of what the Holy City was like, and are better enabled to understand the Bible. The recent tracing of a wall on the south side of the city may lead to important discoveries, but it would be premature here to speculate on the age of that wall; but it is all in keeping with what might have been expected. The ancient walls of Jerusalem have been exposed at several points, but nothing yet sufficient has been recovered in any way to settle the dispute as to the site of the Holy Sepulchre. I do not think that we can ever arrive at anything more than settling where Constantine considered the site of the Holy Sepulchre was, and I sincerely trust this disputed point never will be settled, as I am sure that the enormous interest which exists in the matter is better than the lethargy which would arise were this point settled. In studying the topography of Jerusalem, the account of Josephus has to be considered, and it is remarkable how year by year his reputation is rehabilitated as an historian, and how much nearer we get to a conception of what site the Temple of Herod occupied. Fortunately for this subject, there have been several authoritative Biblical students in the field who have antagonistic theories; and disputes have raged so fiercely over these rival proposals that the greatest interest has been absorbed in the subject. I have no hesitation in giving my opinion that the Palestine Exploration Fund was at first mainly kept up by the intense interest concerning these rival theories, and that the vast addition to our present knowledge of the Bible is due in a great measure to the sometimes bitter disputes that have arisen over rival sites. The principal discoveries in Jerusalem, so far as the Temple is concerned, during recent years, are around the Temple area—*el-Haram-esh-sherif*, of the Moslems—and go far to show what was the position of Herod's Temple and enclosures, and to indicate the limit of that of Solomon, and the site of Solomon's palaces. Here again, happily, nothing is absolutely certain, so that great interest still attaches to this subject. Excavations

have proved that the great wall of the *Haram-esh-sherif* is buried at the N. E., S. E., and S. W. angles, to a depth of from 80 to 120 feet—a succession of layers of rubbish thrown over the Temple walls at each capture and rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem. These walls also rose above the ground to a height of from 80 to 100 feet, supporting a huge platform 900 feet by 1,700 feet, and near these was a colonnade some fifty feet high, so that the walls at the angles must have risen to a height of from 200 to 250 feet. The great gateway and bridges which gave entrance and exit to these great courts of the Temple have also been found, and stones in the outer wall are still visible weighing over ninety tons. This great structure is unique among the known ruins of the world, and was no doubt at all times a very stupendous edifice as compared with buildings elsewhere. It is considered that where Moslem, Jewish, and Christian traditions concur, they are likely to be correct. In the sacred rock of the Harem we have a case in which the several sects invest it with sacred attributes, and we may look upon it as the traditional site of the Holy of Holies, or of the altar of the original Temple. Absolute certainty is not to be obtained, but we have now sufficient to rely upon to enable us to study our Bible with Jerusalem as we know it to have been, instead of a map of possibilities.

Giving out of the Law—Samaritans at Gerizim.—To my mind some of the strongest pieces of evidence to be brought forward from the Holy Land in favour of the credibility of the Scriptures lies in the survival at the present day of old customs and manners among the people. When you live in Palestine, so little change has taken place that you live back in old Biblical times, and it is borne in upon you that the Biblical accounts are a correct rendering of the thoughts of the people. But of all the customs which now exist, I know of nothing so conspicuous and important as that to be seen on the top of Mount Gerizim at the time of the Passover, an institution established among the heathen nearly three thousand years ago, according to the Biblical accounts, and still going on without intermission, there being records of it from time to time throughout history. It seems to me little use in making discoveries for the sake of establishing our faith, when so little use is made of this convincing fact. We have an account in 2 Kings xvii., that after the Assyrian Conquest of Israel this country became infested with wild beasts, and that the stranger Cuthites attributed this calamity to the anger of the local Deity, and obtained the services of Jewish priests to instruct them in the Jewish religious rites. Since that time the Jewish rites have been practised, but in antagonism to the Jews, so that the Pentateuch in possession of the Samaritans has been handed down without a possibility of any collusion with the Jews; and yet here we have the Books of Moses only differing from those of the Jews in some reference to Mount Gerizim, which would be expected. Here, then, we have the strongest corroboration of the credibility of the Scriptures in the customs and ceremonies of the Jews and the Samaritan Pentateuch. At the present day the Samaritans still exist in a small band, and carry on their Jewish service, which the Jews themselves have passed away for two thousand years. What a remarkable piece of evidence this is for anyone who wishes to be convinced by what is to be found in Palestine.

PAPERS.

(2) Recently discovered MSS.

F. C. Burkitt, Esq., M.A., 12, Harvey Road, Cambridge.

In the wide subject of "The Authority and Credibility of the Bible as affected by recent discoveries of manuscripts," I feel that my way is

clearly marked out. I cannot but be conscious that I am standing here in Norwich in the place of a great Oriental scholar—the late Professor Bensly, himself a Norwich man. Had he been here with us he would have spoken to you about the manuscript with which his name will always be associated; in respect therefore to Professor Bensly's memory, as well as on account of the great importance of the subject, I shall chiefly confine my remarks to the Syriac Palimpsest of the Four Gospels, lately found by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson in the Convent of S. Catherine on Mount Sinai.

One cannot complain that any lack of interest was shown in England on the publication of the Sinai Palimpsest; on the contrary, few manuscripts of any part of the Bible have led to such a volume of discussion. So high, in fact, an estimate of its value seems to have been formed by some who have already written on the subject, that I do not think it will be needless to remind you of the limits of the information that a single manuscript of a translation of the Four Canonical Gospels can give us. Fresh evidence directly affecting the authority and credibility of the Gospels—that is, their position in the Church and their historical value—can only come from newly discovered traditions about the composition of the Gospels, and newly discovered narratives parallel to the Four Gospels and independent of them.

The Sinai Palimpsest cannot claim to be reckoned under either of these heads. It is not, for instance, like the Fayyûm Fragment, in which some scholars fancy they recognize a piece of the document underlying both S. Mark and S. Matthew; though I may remark by the way that any theory has a very insecure foundation which rests upon the supposed origin of a tiny piece of papyrus two inches square, about which all that is certainly known is that it contains our Lord's prediction of S. Peter's denial as in S. Matthew and S. Mark, but with different Greek words for "cock" and "crow."

In a few words the importance of the new discovery consists in this. I believe the Sinai Palimpsest to be a very faithful representative of the earliest Syriac translation of the Gospels. The Palimpsest itself is a vellum manuscript written in the fourth or the early part of the fifth century, but the version of which it is a copy is very much more ancient. This version is certainly older than the Peshîttâ (Peshitto), which is not earlier than the fourth century; probably older than the Syriac Diatessaron, which is not earlier than 170 A.D. Of this version of the Gospels only one other manuscript is known to survive besides our Palimpsest, namely the Codex in the British Museum used by Cureton; from this, however, more than half the contents are wanting, and its text has certainly undergone revision from the Greek. In the Sinai Palimpsest considerably more than three-fourths of the whole of the Gospels is legible, and its text shows no clear signs of revision from later Greek manuscripts.

What, then, can we learn from this second century translation of the Gospels, of which we now have so excellent a representative in the Sinai Palimpsest? From what class of Greek manuscripts has it been translated?

A very few words upon the types of text found in Greek manuscripts of the Gospels may here be convenient. The so-called *Textus Receptus* must always be our first standard of comparison in estimating the

value of a new manuscript; not because it chanced to be that of the ordinary printed editions and of our English authorised version, but because it really is the text that has been generally current in the Greek Church ever since the fifth century. This is, in fact, the text found in the vast majority of our thousand and more Greek manuscripts of the Gospels. With this text the Latin Vulgate and the Syriac Vulgate (commonly called the Peshîttâ) often agree, but it differs very greatly from the text of the Ante-Nicene Church. It is not the text of our two oldest Greek manuscripts, ℵ and B, nor again of the Old Latin versions and the associated Codex Bezæ, generally quoted as D. For this reason it appeared to Dr. Hort that the general uniformity of the rest of our Greek manuscripts of the New Testament was not a sign that they had faithfully preserved the Apostolic original, but was the result of an official revision early in the fourth century. This revised edition became a kind of standard to which subsequent manuscripts were conformed. It seems to have taken place at or near Antioch in Syria, so that the text embodied in it is generally called "Syrian" or "Antiochene." I shall use the term "Antiochene," because of the possible confusion between the "Syrian" Greek text and manuscripts written in the Syriac language.

Now it is the simple fact that no purely "Antiochene" reading occurs in the Sinai Palimpsest. A marked illustration of this statement is found in its steady rejection of the "conflate" readings, *i.e.*, passages where two ancient rival readings have been fused together in the Antiochene text. Here is an illustration. In Mark ix. 49, ℵ, B, and their few supporters read, *For everyone shall be salted with fire;* instead of this, Codex Bezæ and the Old Latin versions have, *For every sacrifice shall be salted with salt*, a reminiscence of Leviticus. The Antiochene text, on the other hand, with the Latin Vulgate, the Peshîttâ, and all the later versions, brings together the two rival readings, producing the familiar combination, *For everyone shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.* But the Sinai Palimpsest has only, *For everyone shall be salted with fire*, thus agreeing exactly with ℵ, B, and, I may add, the English Revised Version.

This is but one instance of the way in which the new manuscript supports Dr. Hort's theory of the Antiochene revision of the Greek text of the New Testament. The theory demanded that no Antiochene reading should occur in the Old Syriac version; a manuscript of the Old Syriac version is found, and no Antiochene reading occurs in it. Never has a critical theory been so signally confirmed by subsequent discovery of new material. It is a pathetic circumstance that the great scholar passed away but a few months before the transcription of the manuscript.

The Sinai Palimpsest supports the text of Westcott and Hort in many other respects besides the rejection of Antiochene readings. In particular, it is singularly free from interpolations. Thus the Lord's Prayer in S. Luke consists of only five petitions, as in our Revised Version; the episode of the Bloody Sweat and the prayer, *Father, forgive them*, are altogether absent. In S. Matthew the passages about "discerning the face of the sky," and the devils "which go not out save by prayer and fasting," are not read. The Gospel of S. Mark ends at xvi. 8, without a trace of the "last twelve verses"; in fact the Gospel

of S. Luke begins on the same column with hardly a break. In this our manuscript differs from the Curetonian manuscript, which had the twelve verses as well as the longer form of the Lord's Prayer. But the passages absent from the Sinai Palimpsest are not all found in the Curetonian; in many cases the Curetonian agrees with the new manuscript in omissions. The inconsistency of the Curetonian in this respect tends to show that the Sinai Palimpsest, which omits all these interpolations, here accurately represents the original form of the Old Syriac translation.

But the agreement of our manuscript with B and Dr. Hort is not confined to the absence of interpolations. A good example is Luke iv. 44, where we read in ℵ, B, and the Sinai Palimpsest, "And He was preaching in the synagogues of *Judæa*"; instead of "in the synagogues of *Galilee*," as in the received text and the Latin versions. But perhaps the most remarkable instance is found in S. Mark's account of S. Peter's denial. S. Mark, alone among the four evangelists, mentions the double cock-crow, but in as few words as possible. Accordingly we find great variety of reading in the four verses of chapter xiv. where the incident is mentioned, and the only authorities which consistently supported the text of Westcott and Hort were B, a Greek lectionary, and the Coptic. To these we can now add the Old Syriac, for in each of the four places the readings so acutely defended by Dr. Hort are found in the Sinai Palimpsest.

Coincidences so striking as these between B and the Sinai Palimpsest are all the more weighty as the two manuscripts are shown by other readings to be wholly independent witnesses. Where they agree they agree in preserving the right reading, and it is a principle of textual criticism that only when manuscripts agree in wrong readings we may assume any close relationship between them. Moreover, the allies of the two manuscripts are geographically very different. The chief ally of B is the Coptic (also called Memphitic), *i.e.*, the version of Lower Egypt. The Sinai Palimpsest, on the other hand, is often allied with D and the Old Latin versions—with those types of Greek text, in fact, which, whatever may have been their origin, were so widely spread in the second century, and which are generally comprehended under the convenient but misleading name of "Western."

Instances of such "Western" readings in the Sinai Palimpsest are innumerable; among the more noteworthy are the geographical variant, *Magedan* for *Dalmanutha*, in Mark viii. 10, and the striking expression "being grieved for the *deadness* of their hearts," in Mark iii. 5, instead of *hardness* or rather *blindness* (νεκρώσει for πωρώσει); it also has *last* for *first* in Matthew xxi. 31; a curious reading, whereby the Jews are made to answer that the son in the parable who said "I go, sir," and went not, was the one who obeyed the will of his father. In John iii. 6, according to the Sinai Palimpsest, our Lord says to Nicodemus, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit, *for God is (a) Living Spirit.*" Some people have accused our Palimpsest of being a heretical copy of the Gospels. S. Ambrose, who was accustomed to read this verse much as it stands in the Sinai manuscript, says that the ordinary text is here heretical. He complains that the words, "For God is Spirit," had been cut out from this passage

by the Arians. I see no reason for thinking that either charge of heresy is well founded.

In these and many similar instances, the Sinai Palimpsest agrees with the Old Latin versions and with Codex Bezæ (where extant), but with scarcely any other surviving Greek manuscript. Nevertheless it must not hastily be assumed that the Old Syriac and the Old Latin versions are fundamentally related in text. In saying this I am aware that the exact opposite is very commonly believed. At present I am only pleading for a suspension of judgment in the matter. It is in any case the misfortune of the Old Syriac version that its most characteristic peculiarities are inadequately represented in surviving primary Greek manuscripts. We have to make up for the deficiency by collecting the scattered readings which have escaped Antiochene revision in certain groups of cursives. One such group agrees with our manuscript in inserting the name *Jesus* before *Barabbas* in Matthew xxvii. 16, 17, so that Pilate's question runs, "*Whom will ye that I release unto you? Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?*" This remarkable reading was known to Origen, but it is by no means certain that it did not originate in a scribe's blunder.

After all, the most important single piece of evidence brought forward by the new discovery is the complete absence of the so-called "last twelve verses" of S. Mark in the Sinai Palimpsest. It is worth noticing how the geographical chain of evidence against the twelve verses has been thereby extended. From Carthage, from Egypt, from Palestine, and now from Syria, the earliest texts are all unfavourable, while the only second century evidence for the verses comes from Italy and Gaul. Even Tatian lived in Rome.

Quite lately Mr. Conybeare has discovered a note in an Armenian manuscript of the Gospels which seems to ascribe the twelve verses to Aristion, who is known to us through a celebrated passage in Eusebius as the contemporary of Papias. If this be so, we must date the twelve verses some half a century earlier than would otherwise seem probable. Before accepting the new evidence, however, we must make sure that it is a real tradition, and not the guess of some ancient Armenian scholar. Victor of Capua in the sixth century used his Eusebius to make an admirable conjecture; the unknown Armenian may have set to work in the same way. If, however, the ascription of the twelve verses to Aristion be only a learned man's conjecture, it has no more authority than the improbable statement current in some late manuscripts that S. Bartholomew translated the Hebrew Gospel of S. Matthew into Greek.

But even though we should accept Aristion as the man who added the twelve verses, the genuine text of the Gospel breaks off, as in the Sinai Palimpsest, at xvi. 8. We have therefore in any case to face the fact that the Gospel of S. Mark, as it has come down to us, is imperfect at the end—that is, that all our manuscripts are probably derived from a single copy that had lost its last leaf. A clear recognition of this is essential, not only to the textual critic, but even to those who are attacking the great problem of the literary relation of our S. Mark to the other Synoptic Gospels.

There is one other point upon which I should like to say a very few words, though it is a point which I am inclined to think has received

already more attention than it deserves. This is the reading of the Sinai Palimpsest in Matt. i. 16, where the common text reads, "*Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ.*" Instead of this we find in our Palimpsest: "*Jacob begat Joseph; Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus who is called Christ.*"

Textual critics know that this reading, unique as it is, does not stand absolutely isolated; for in the "Ferrar Group" of Greek manuscripts, in the old Latin, and in the Curetonian Syriac, we read (with minor variations) as follows: "*Jacob begat Joseph, to whom being betrothed Mary the Virgin brought forth Jesus Christ;*" the word for "begat" and "brought forth" (ἐγέννησεν) being identical in the Greek.

The conflicting claims of these readings with the common text certainly present a very interesting critical problem. The common text is found in ℵ, B, and indeed all Greek manuscripts but two; it is also supported by Tertullian (*de Carne Christi* 20). On the other hand, we have seen that some form or other of the alternative is supported by both the ancient second century versions. When we examine these rival readings, we find that each of them contains an expression which might give offence to a casual reader. That this is the case with regard to the reading of our Palimpsest is obvious, but we have evidence also that the expression "husband of Mary" in the ordinary text proved a stumbling-block in ancient times. Moreover, each of the rival readings contains a suspicious phrase. It is easy to see how the ἐγέννησεν, "he begat," of the Sinai text might be paraphrased into ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη, "she from whom was born." On the other hand, if the received reading be the result of a correction in the interest of the ordinary belief as to the Birth of Christ, how are we to explain the presence of the title "Mary the Virgin," in the (supposed) heterodox version, and its absence in the (supposed) orthodox one?

It is not, however, critical niceties of this description which directed attention to our manuscript at the moment of publication, but a feeling that if the reading of the Sinai Palimpsest be that of the authentic text of the Gospel of S. Matthew, our ideas as to the historical events of the Nativity would undergo a revolution. This feeling I believe to be altogether erroneous. No possible historical conclusion, no possible light upon the facts of the Nativity, could ever be deduced from the genealogy which the First Evangelist has placed at the head of his Gospel. Had the statement that Jesus was the son of Joseph been found in the genealogy given by S. Luke, the case would have been very different, for there is nothing directly to show that the lineage of Joseph there given does not contain the names of his actual ancestors up to David and beyond. But the genealogy in S. Matthew is too artificial to be the record of an actual line of descent; it is rather the Evangelist's statement of claim that Jesus Christ was the Heir of David. Even should we accept the reading of the Sinai Palimpsest, the statement "Joseph begat Jesus" would mean no more than the parallel one "Jechonias begat Salathiel"—that Jechonias, of whom Jeremiah prophesied with such tremendous emphasis (Jer. xxii. 30): "*Thus saith the Lord, write ye this man childless.*"

There can be little doubt that the genealogy in S. Matthew was shaped into its present form by the Evangelist himself, not

borrowed from a previously existing document. The whole question therefore is narrowed into the meaning the Evangelist wished in this genealogy to attach to the word ἐγέννησεν, "begat." Now it is open to the critic who does not accept the Virgin Birth to base his rejection of it on the silence of S. Mark, S. John, and S. Paul, but to claim that the man who compiled our Canonical Gospel of S. Matthew did not believe in the Virgin Birth of our Lord is absurd. The reading of the Sinai Palimpsest in the disputed passage, even if it be accepted as the authentic text of the Gospel, leaves the old difficulties exactly as they were.

Dr. Montague R. James, Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum, and Senior Dean of King's College, Cambridge.

Any sketch, pretending to completeness, of the discoveries which the last few years have brought to searchers in the field of ancient Christian and Jewish literature would speedily resolve itself into a catalogue; for these discoveries, if often small in bulk, have been exceedingly numerous. Libraries already known have yielded, besides a good store of Apocryphal documents, such notable works as the Latin version of S. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, parts of the Commentary of S. Hippolytus on the Book of Daniel, and of that of S. Victorinus on the Revelation; not to mention important Acts of Martyrs, as those of S. Apollonius, or the original text of the Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs; together with numbers of small fragments which help to fill up gaps in the history of Christian thought.

Under these circumstances, I have thought it well to keep clear of any attempt to cover the whole field; and I will, with your permission, confine myself to a small portion of it, and try to set before you some of the important additions to our knowledge which have come in quite recent times from Egypt. As you are aware, the finds of Greek and Coptic documents in the cemeteries there have been exceedingly rich; and one is glad to think that they are not in the least likely to come to an end yet.

Among the papers which have come to light are large numbers of private letters in Greek, dating from Ptolemaic and from Roman times. They are not copies of letters, but the actual letters themselves, and they afford us a knowledge, which we could hardly have been said to possess before, of the forms and phrases which ordinary middle-class Greeks employed in their private correspondence. A German scholar, Herr Deissmann, has had the happy idea of comparing them with the letters contained in the New Testament; and from this examination some very interesting results have accrued. Not merely do we find that the addresses and farewells of the letters from Egypt are drawn on the same lines as those of S. Paul's Epistles—that we should have anticipated—the surprise comes when we discover in them some of the phrases which we had supposed to be characteristically Pauline. Thus, a wife writes to her husband: "Before all things I pray that you may be in health, and I make prayer for you every day to our Lord Serapis." And a woman, writing in the year 172 B.C. to her brother, says: "I am well, and so are all in the house, making

continual mention of you." The words "in our prayers" are without doubt to be supplied. I need not multiply instances; it is plain that in these letters we have a fund of material which is likely to prove exceedingly valuable in the higher criticism of the Catholic and Pauline Epistles.

Of the Coptic documents few have as yet been printed; but among those which are shortly to be published are two Apocryphal Revelations, which must contain very interesting matter. They are the Apocalypse of Zephaniah, and that of Elijah. Both books are known to have been in existence as early as the second century, and, according to a constant, though not necessarily true, tradition, it was from the Apocalypse of Elijah that S. Paul quoted the words in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (ii. 9), "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the head of man to conceive, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him."

But among all the discoveries, the foremost place is undoubtedly due to the little parchment volume whose contents were first printed in 1892. It gave us a large portion of the Book of Enoch in Greek, and also the two famous fragments of the Gospel and Revelation of S. Peter. These two latter documents I intend to take as the texts of my paper, and I am to try and tell you in few words the present state of opinion about them. I must begin with the Gospel of Peter.

The first flood of literature consequent upon the appearance of the fragment has subsided. Harnack, Zahn, Von Schubert, have had their say in Germany; Robinson, Swete, and the author of "Supernatural Religion," in England. It may be said that Dr. Von Schubert and Professor Swete at present hold the field in the two countries. Among the crowd of matters which might be brought out in connection with this "Fifth Gospel"—as it has been rather absurdly called—I can only touch upon four.

The view that the Gospel of Peter is a *secondary* document has largely gained ground of late. By this I mean that critics are coming round to the view that its author had the four Canonical Gospels before him. Dr. Von Schubert has done more to spread this opinion than any other writer; although it was held by many from the first. It is interesting to note that Professor Harnack, whose name deservedly carries great weight in these matters, has declared, in a review of Von Schubert's book, that it now seems probable to him that all of our four Gospels were used by the author of the Gospel of Peter.

A second point of great interest has been made by Dr. Von Schubert. He has shown that the Gospel of Peter has many remarkable points of connection with the famous group of Apocryphal books, which includes the Acts of Pilate (or Gospel of Nicodemus) and the Reports of Pilate to Claudius and to Tiberius. Attention had already been called to some parallels with the latter document by Professor Robinson, but the German scholar has carried the investigation further. Now this connection between Peter's Gospel and the Acts of Pilate has a very interesting side to it. It has been throughout a crucial question whether Justin Martyr, writing about 150 A.D., knew and used the Gospel of Peter, or whether the obligation lay on the other side; for it was not to be denied that some very curious and minute similarities existed between them. Dr. Von Schubert has reminded us that

Justin Martyr twice appeals, in various writings, to certain Acts of the trial of our Lord before Pilate. We no longer possess any such Acts in a form as old as Justin's time, but it is well-nigh certain that the Acts which we do possess are but a re-editing, with additions, and, I daresay, subtractions, of the Acts to which Justin appeals. And the conclusion to which Von Schubert comes, and to which most critics subscribe, is that in the passages where Justin's language so closely approaches that of the false Peter, both writers are using the very ancient Acts of Pilate, which we still possess, though only in a modified form, under the name of the Gospel of Nicodemus.

Another, and a very important point, is the Christology of the Gospel of Peter—its view about the Person of our Lord. At the very first reading of the fragment it seems obvious that the writer wished to represent the Lord as superhuman in every part of His being. He tells us that at the crucifixion He was silent, "as though feeling no pain" (words not in themselves decisive, but unmistakable when taken in connection with others). The cry of thirst is omitted. When Christ dies He is said to be "taken up." The Passion as a whole is hurried over as unimportant, save for the wickedness displayed by the Jews; the body with which Christ rises is in no sense a material one. Last, and not least, the human name of Jesus is nowhere used—He is always described as "the Lord." To put the matter in technical language, the writer's point of view is Docetic; yet his Docetism is veiled.

Within the last few months it has fallen to Professor Robinson and myself to unearth a piece of early Christian literature, which serves very well to illustrate the developed form of this Docetic view—the view which treated Christ's human body as a phantom and His sufferings as mere seeming. The document in question is a long episode from the Acts of S. John the Evangelist, which were probably written by one Leucius in the second half of the second century—possibly even about the same time as the the Gospel of Peter. Two detached fragments of this episode were known already, but we now have several pages to add to them. I propose to quote a few lines, for the matter is new, and, I venture to think, interesting.

S. John, in giving the brethren at Ephesus an account of his intercourse with our Lord, says:—

"When He chose Peter and Andrew, who were brothers, He came to me and my brother James, and said 'I have need of you; come unto Me.' And my brother said, 'John, what meaneth that Child that is upon the shore, and called to us?' And I said, 'What Child?' and he said, 'The one that is beckoning to us.' And I answered, 'Brother James, by reason of the long watch we have kept at sea thou seest not aright; but seest thou not the Man that is standing there, well-favoured, comely, and of a cheerful countenance?' But he said, 'Him I see not, my brother; but let us go out of the ship and see what this meaneth.' And so we brought the ship to land, and there we saw Him also helping with us to settle the ship. And when we departed thence, willing to follow Him, it seemed to me that He was bald-headed and had a long beard; but to James He appeared as a youth well-nigh beardless."

Again: "He took Peter and James and me into the mountain, saying, 'Come ye with Me.' And we went and saw Him praying a

little way off. I therefore, because He loved me, came near unto Him softly, as if He beheld me not; and I stood looking upon Him from behind. And I beheld that He had no vesture, neither was of man's fashion in any wise; and His feet were whiter than snow, so that the earth was lightened by the light of them; and His head reached unto the heaven." (This detail is one that will be remembered as a prominent one in the account of the Resurrection in the Gospel of Peter). "So that I was afraid, and cried out; and He turned, and appeared as a man of small stature."

Grotesque as this is (and I have omitted the baser touches which follow) it is very valuable, as showing the legitimate development of the point of view which appears less overtly in the Gospel of Peter.

One other aspect of this fragment must be touched upon, namely, its relation to early Christian art. It is well-known that the represetnations of our Lord's sufferings are rare in the first four centuries. Pictures of His miracles we have, and of His early life; but the Passion is avoided. Not, I think, solely from a dislike to portray scenes of suffering, though this feeling operated in some degree. There is another reason, at which we guess when we examine the early monuments in which the Passion is actually represented. The first persons who made likenesses of our Lord at all were heretics: so at least we gather from Irenæus. And we are further led to connect these pictures and statues with the Passion by his assertion that the Gnostics, who had them, said that they were derived from a likeness of Christ which had been made by Pilate. We need not, then, be surprised to find plain traces of Docetic feeling, and not improbably of the Gospel of Peter itself, in some early sculptures of the Passion. There is a carving of the Crucifixion on the door of S. Sabina at Rome which is of the fifth century, and in it we see that only the hands of our Lord are pierced with nails. This is a feature in the Petrine Gospel. A sarcophagus in the Lateran Museum is equally instructive. Christ crowned with thorns, Christ mocked, and Christ before Pilate, are among the scenes shown; and in each of them He stands unmoved, or, in the words of the Gospel, "as though feeling no pain." The same monument has a representation of the Resurrection. The monogram of Christ supported by two doves (which symbolise angels) surmounts the cross, which stands between two sleeping guards; and we are inevitably reminded of the description in the Gospel of Christ emerging from the tomb supported by two angels and followed by the cross.

So then, to sum up the position, here is a document of the second century which has influenced both literature and art in its day. It sets forth a view of the person of our Lord which is discredited by the New Testament and by the Church at large, and hence in many points it comes into collision with the Canonical Gospels. Yet it cannot afford to dispense with their help, for it makes use of all the Four; and thus it is a most striking witness to their authority and to their early reception.

However, it is time for me to turn to the second part of my subject, the text of which is the fragment of the Revelation of Peter which the little book from the grave at Akhmim yielded. Those who have read this fragment will remember that its main contents are a description of paradise and the dwellers there, and a much longer description of hell, and of the punishments assigned to particular sins. Less interest has

been excited, in England at least, by the Apocalypse than by the Gospel; and, no doubt from the religious point of view, this is intelligible and right. Yet if we once realize what this Apocalypse meant to those who read it, we shall welcome it as a book of far wider influence, and far more ancient connexions than the Gospel was. It is a direct link between heathendom and the Church.

We have all heard of the mysteries—Eleusinian, Bacchic, and Orphic—but it is doubtful if many of us have appreciated their extreme importance as a religious element in the ancient world; and it is yet more doubtful whether, in the very few moments which remain at my disposal, I can so sketch their position as to let you see how large they must have loomed before the mind's eye of Greeks and Romans in the time of Christ. Their great function (and in this they resembled the Egyptian *Ritual of the Dead)* was to supply the initiated with a passport to happiness in the next world. From their hierophants men learned the passwords that should give them safe conduct through the perilous regions below, and procure them an abundant entrance into the land of life. Trivial, barbaric, and superstitious as the system must probably have been in its first beginnings, it speedily gained on Greek soil an ethical and religious importance of a very high order. Not merely by the performance of definite rites, nor by the correct repetition of unmeaning formulæ, could the guardians of the Elysian fields be appeased; it was at first freedom from the stains of theft, murder, and adultery, and then the proved assertion of a righteous and beneficent life which became the necessary qualifications for a happy immortality. And as the Greek world came to be over-run by ruder invading races, and the great national sanctuaries were impoverished and desolated, and the simple worship of the local gods ceased to satisfy a people who were no longer prosperous, it was a natural and an actual consequence that their attention and interest were turned more earnestly towards another world, undisturbed by wars and tumult, and to a priesthood which offered them the key thereto. So it came about that the Orphic religion was a great factor in the religious life of the Greeks; and the conquering Romans, as they grew dissatisfied with the old gods of Italy, were not slow to add this element of Greek culture to their many borrowings from their poorer neighbours. Many heathen Apocalypses have come down to us, which drew their inspiration from the Orphic mysteries. I need but name two, which will be familiar to most here: the myth of Er, the son of Armenius, in the tenth book of Plato's "Republic"; and the visit of Æneas to the shades in the sixth book of Virgil's "Æneid."

Of this literature the Revelation of Peter is a direct descendant. Alike in its description of the dwellers in paradise and its enumeration of the various classes of sinners in hell, each of whom is undergoing a punishment appropriate to their sin, there runs throughout it a complete parallelism with the scheme of the Orphic religion.

Thus, early in the second century, the heathen heaven and hell were transferred into the popular Christian heaven and hell through the agency of the Revelation of Peter. Once in Christian hands, the theme was developed in many ways. Books purporting to relate the visions of S. Paul, of the Virgin Mary, of the ancient patriarchs, prophets and sibyls, or of men and women raised from the dead, met

with a ready reception. The dialogues of S. Gregory the Great, and the lives of northern seers, such as Fursey and Tungal, brought new races under the domain of these conceptions, and at length, in the Divine Comedy, the great epic of the middle ages, one of the foremost poets of the world gave them a new and lasting life. The hell of the painter Orcagna and of the poet Dante, the terrible images which covered the walls of our English Churches in mediæval times, and of the churches of Greece at this day—the material hell which has frightened and repelled not a few thinking men from what they supposed to be the religion of Christ, has its roots anywhere save in that religion. It was an inheritance brought over by the converts from heathenism. Future investigations may perhaps teach us to trace it back to Egypt, or to find its elements in some of the great Eastern systems; but, in the form in which the Revelation of Peter imported it into the Christian Church, it is a Greek conception.

To point the contrast between the Gospel of Peter and the Four Gospels, or between the sayings of the Lord and the Petrine Apocalypse, demands more time than I can afford; but to draw the line between the two earliest Christian Apocalypses may be worth attempting. The earliest is the Revelation of S. John the Divine, and the next in date is the Revelation of Peter. In the Revelation of S. John we have two styles of writing. One appears in the letters to the Seven Churches, and may be called the hortatory or didactic; the other, which predominates in the rest of the book, is the predictive, and it takes the form of symbolic visions. This method is the one which characterizes the great Jewish Apocalypses, such as the books of Daniel and Enoch, and the fourth book of Esdras.

The Revelation of Peter, on the other hand, deals almost exclusively in the description of things seen which have no symbolic meaning. The flowers of paradise and the caldrons or sharp stones of hell do not represent to the writer's mind love and joy in the one case, and the pangs of remorse in the other. They are actual objects which the writer conceives of as existing in the next world. But the vials, the wild beasts, the New Jerusalem, and the lake of fire in S. John's Revelation, indisputably represented to his mind such conceptions as periods of trouble, world-powers, and places of happiness and of punishment.

Thus the gulf which separates the two books is an enormously wide one. We may—I think we should—look with interest and sympathy upon the Revelation of Peter, because of the antiquity of the beliefs which it enshrines and the vital importance of the hopes and fears which are bound up in them; hopes and fears from which no generation has been exempt since man became a living soul. Yet it can never avail to inspire us with the wonder and affection which, in all ages, have attracted Christian children and Christian men to the Revelation of S. John the Divine.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

I HAVE to announce, with regret, that the Rev. C. J. Ball is prevented from being here by domestic affliction. The list of selected Readers and Speakers has therefore come to an end. A number of cards have been sent up to me, and the first is that of a Speaker known to Church authority as the Rev. J. Leycester Lyne.

The Rev. J. LEYCESTER LYNE (Father Ignatius).

I HAVE not very much to say, dear fellow-Churchmen and fellow-Christians, this time; but it is the title of the discussion that rather troubled me as a Christian and a member of the Church of England—"The Authority and Credibility of the Old and New Testaments as affected by recent discoveries." Well, the authority and credibility of the Old and New Testaments may be very much affected by recent discoveries, in the minds of unbelievers; but no amount of discoveries can touch the faith of the Holy Ghost-taught Christian respecting the Old and New Testaments. Jesus Christ is our sole authority for the authority of the Old Testament. The Holy Ghost as speaking through the Universal Church, is our sole authority for the credibility of the New. Perhaps to some of our friends it may appear that the survival of the Old Testament Scriptures, when all other contemporary writings sank into the grave of oblivion, is merely an illustration of the survival of the fittest. But we Christians believe that the survival of the writings of the Old Testament, when all writings contemporaneous with them were lost in oblivion, shows that the one has the power of divine truth in it, and the other has not. Those discoveries in Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt are intensely interesting. They are also very amusing; but to quote them in support of the Old Testament, or against, seems to me very much out of place. It seems almost like bringing a dead body into argument with a living body. The Old Testament Scriptures are a living power. They are a living power to-day. The New Testament is a fulfilment of the Old, just as the Catholic Church has sprung from the womb of the synagogue; and we take both Testaments together, each proving the other to be divine. So the synagogue is proved to be divine by its product—the Catholic Church. The very existence of the Jews as a nation in our midst at the present day, shows us that the Jews as a nation, and the Scriptures which they produced, have both been preserved as an unique ethnological and an unique literary phenomenon, by the power of God alone. The power of the world, both ancient and modern, has tried to obliterate the Jew, or is trying now, as in Russia, to amalgamate and assimilate the blood of Israel with the blood of the Gentile. The Jew remains unique among the nations because the Almighty has declared, "You are my witnesses that I am God," and therefore the world cannot destroy the Jew or the Old Testament Scriptures. Down in the depths of ancient oblivion and ruin, all these curious archæological accumulations of the past have been buried for ages; "Moses and the Prophets" alone survived, because they are the written Word of God. The Bible, the Old Testament Scriptures, have lived through the ages, and they are living still, producing new life, hope, peace, love, liberty, in the hearts and minds of countless men and women to-day. Therefore, as a Church of England man and a Christian, I do not like the title of the paper.

The Rev. G. H. HARFORD-BATTERSBY, Rector of Middle Claydon, Winslow.

ONE of the improvements in modern warfare has been the introduction of smokeless powder. Amongst other advantages, it tends to prevent regiments from firing upon their comrades in other regiments of the same army. It were to be wished that in theological controversy something like smokeless powder could be introduced. As it is, it often happens that eager combatants after firing a volley get confused, and turn their guns upon those who are really fighting on the same side. Even professors may do this; and I hope it will not be thought an act of presumption on the part of a humble country parson to make a mild but firm protest against some things said by that ingenious, learned, and indefatigable scholar, Professor Sayce, at whose feet I was privileged to sit in my Oxford days. Even a worm will turn, and as one who for some years has devoted the best part of his scanty leisure to furthering the work of the literary criticism of the Hexateuch, I feel as if my fellow workers and myself had been, to use a strong expression, "jumped upon." Professor Sayce declared that the critical analysis of the Old Testament depended mainly on the tacit assumption that writing was not known until long after the time of the events related, and that the discoveries of archæology, such as the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, had swept away this assumption. But I, for one, know no scholar who has adopted this as a pre-supposition, or as a basis of argument. On the contrary, it is only put forward as the conclusion of an inductive process of literary and historical enquiry. Suppose anyone were to argue that because Romans writing Latin lived in Britain long ago, therefore the contemporary Britons were a literary people, that would be not less

irrelevant than to argue from the presence of cultivated races in Canaan to the culture of the ancient Hebrews. That must be proved, if at all, by other means. Then the Professor proposed by the plausible method of a *reductio ad absurdum* to meet criticism, as if it were impossible to separate a single verse among three documents. Years ago I was under a similar impression; but closer enquiry has convinced me, and other fellow workers with me, that the seemingly incredible thing is true, and that writers did so impress their individuality upon their work that it can be identified and disentangled, even after it has been combined by an editor with other documents. And if Professor Sayce is correct in hinting that there is no *Mosaic* work in the Pentateuch, why is it that since 1892 there have appeared three works giving Genesis (or more) in English with the documents provisionally separated, viz., Fripps' "Genesis," Bacon's "Genesis of Genesis" and his "Exodus," and Addis's "Oldest Book of Hebrew History;" while the great Haupt Bible, in which most of the best Hebrew scholars of the day are combining to exhibit by colours the analysis of the documents, is on the verge of publication. A new edition of "Genesis," by Wade, can be seen in proof at the Ecclesiastical Art Exhibition here; and there will shortly appear an analytical edition of the Hexateuch, which will make more clear, it is hoped, than ever before the grounds on which the analysis is based. Are all these scholars, and the English and Scotch Professors of Hebrew and Old Testament interpretation who think with them, on the wrong track? We believe it will become increasingly plain that they are not. What, then, is the relation between literary criticism and archæological and geographical discovery? The one cannot dominate or control the other, but they are co-ordinate methods of enquiry, and each may help the other. It is the business of literary criticism to separate the distinct documents, whose historical character can then often be inferred from data supplied by discovery, while no inference would be possible so long as the composite work had not been analyzed. As an example, it may be mentioned that the land of Goshen, of which Sir Charles Warren spoke, is only mentioned as the distinct abode of Israel in Egypt in one of the three main documents which tell the story of the "Exodus," and that document is the one which on other grounds appears more primitive and historically trustworthy than the others. Another instance of the confirmation of record by discovery is given in the recent reprint by the Palestine Exploration Fund of a Mohammedan account of a remarkable stoppage of the Jordan many centuries ago, during which a bridge was repaired from the bed of the river, thus furnishing a striking parallel to the event related in Joshua. We are under a great debt of obligation to Sir Charles Warren for having so clearly laid down that Scripture cannot rest on archæology for its authority, but must look to it for elucidation and illustration. The Scriptures, as we hold it, rest on Christ crucified, who is so plainly pointed to in the Old Testament. If anyone's faith is on so insecure a basis that he feels he may wake up any morning to find it exploded by some new discovery, then that faith had better be shattered, that it may be built up more securely. The religion of the Psalms and the Prophets is the central reality, and any particle of fact which may help us to understand better the conditions and circumstances in which it arose is precious. May literary criticism, historical research, and archæological discovery work together to increase our knowledge of what is, after all, only the truth, which must do good.

The Rev. GEORGE ENSOR, Vicar of Peel, Isle of Man; and Rural Dean.

I WANT to call attention to the extreme significance of the statement of Professor Sayce. I do not believe in my experience of Church Congresses that we ever met with such a complete, so far as it went, nor so exhaustive and distinct a confirmation of the Old Testament in some of its most obscure, difficult, and historical points. I do think we should bear that in mind. I do not think it is necessary that we should insist upon having a solution of any historical difficulty in the Old Testament that may arise on the very day that we are confronted by that difficulty. We must be patient. I mention one historical difficulty which may puzzle some even old Cambridge men here to-day. Some years ago there was a bracket for third and fourth place in the classic tripos. One of these gentlemen I knew. Yet, though he was bracketed third, there were three gentlemen above him that year who took a classical degree. One was Mr. Robey, the well-known author of the Grammar. It is only a few King's men who can explain how that came about. In that year King's gave its own degrees. But it is such a peculiarly minute matter that anyone taking down the Cambridge Calendar would say that it should not be relied upon for accurate

historic testimony. I mention that as illustrative of one difficulty. In respect to Darius the Mede, I would ask if any of you will spare the time from the cultivation of the last phase of the rose, or something of that sort, to investigate these historical matters. If you do you will find a delightful field of research. Take the siege of Babylon. If you look at the history of the time, given either in "The Records of the Past," or in Professor Sayce's "Ezra, Esther, and Nehemiah," or Schrader's Series, you will find a marvellous confirmation of the exact story in Daniel. You will find it stated that the army of Cyrus entered Babylon without fighting. I lay great stress on the fact that a romance writer, describing the capture of Babylon, would almost inevitably have invested it with details of carnage, heroism, and so forth. There is a silence about that in the narrative of Daniel which is corroborated in a remarkable degree. The tablets show that there was no fighting that night in Babylon. I pass on to Darius the Mede. I take it that is at present an historical difficulty, but I do not take it that it is an insoluble difficulty. I say this solution has not yet arrived, though I believe in due time it will come to those who are patient, and to those whose faith enables them to wait. In connection with this, Mr. Pinches' suggestion as to Gobryas may show a connection between Gobryas and Darius. However that may be, time will bring the right solution. Anybody who has studied the history of hostile criticism, anybody who remembers the controversy about the Hittites, anybody who remembers the criticism stated in the most conclusive manner against Genesis xiv., knows that these adverse criticisms have been swept clean away by later discoveries. Those who remember how Genesis xiv. was most pre-eminently assailed by hostile criticism now know how completely that criticism has been swept away by Professor Sayce. Therefore we have no reason to be afraid. Cicero said, "to be ignorant of the past is to remain a child for ever," and, depend upon it, if we read the history of criticism, we shall be in good heart and in good courage for the future. We are not afraid of tablets; we are not afraid of documents. Though we have *a priori* conceptions as to the veracity of the Old Testament, we are not afraid of the disinterring of the old tablets. We do not discourage it. We cannot afford to use the language of discouragement or of disrespect about them. We believe God is raising them to the surface through the hands of skilful and honest inquirers, and that at the right time difficulties will disappear. The time will come; even as God is the Author of nature and the Author of revelation, so He, too, is King of history, and the King never can contradict Himself.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

OUR time is come to an end; and we draw to a conclusion one of the most interesting sessions of the Congress. It would be impossible even to endeavour to sum up a discussion which has touched so many points, and touched them in all cases by master hands. But there are just two points which have arisen out of the discussion on which I desire to say one word before I dismiss the meeting. The one has reference to the very interesting speech of the last Speaker but one. I apprehend that the position which archæological and literary discovery hold towards what has been called the "higher," *a priori* criticism, is by no means one of opposition, but is unquestionably one of correction. There are always two forms of arguments, the *a posteriori*, and the *a priori* arguments, and these must necessarily balance and correct each other. There was a question once before the Law Courts in regard to a certain document, "Was it, or was it not, the writing of a certain person?" A number of experts were called who said it was impossible that that person could have written it. A witness was then brought forward who declared that he had seen that person write it; and I believe the person himself finally confessed that it came from his hand. There was an instance where *a posteriori* evidence served to correct the conclusions of *a priori* criticism. I am now inclined to think that some such process is taking place with regard to what some critics tell us of the origin and nature of the documents of the Old Testament, when they describe how the various hands did their work as confidently as if they had stood there and collated the various manuscripts themselves. With regard to the other point—the title of the discussion itself. Of course it never entered into the minds of the Subjects Committee to suppose that the faith of Christians in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, depended, or ought to be affected by, archæological discovery or literary criticism. But they felt, I suppose, that the division which was made by one of the speakers, drawing a hard and fast line between believers and unbelievers, was not a complete and exhaustive description. There are many earnest believers, and persons who desire to believe, who hold an intermediate position, and whose minds are more or

less affected by the confident assertions of higher criticism, and by all the new revelations of archæological discovery. Perhaps the great value of such a discussion as that of to-day is not to those who are unbelievers on the one side, or to those whose faith stands impregnable on the other, but to that class whom I may without offence call the "weaker brethren." I believe myself that to that very large class, a larger class, I think, than some of my brother clergy imagine, the discussion of to-day will be exceedingly fruitful of suggestion and encouragement, and perhaps I may also say of comfort.

S. ANDREW'S HALL,

WEDNESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 9TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE CHURCH.

(1) THE CHURCH AS AFFECTED BY THE PREVAILING AGRICULTURAL DISTRESS.
(2) REMEDIES.
  (*a*) NATIONAL CHURCH SUSTENTATION FUND.
  (*b*) UNION OF SMALL BENEFICES AND OTHER REMEDIES.

PAPERS.

J. SANCROFT HOLMES, Esq., President of the Norfolk Chamber of Agriculture.

To form any accurate estimate as to the effect of agricultural distress upon the Church, it is necessary to define as clearly as possible the measure and extent of the distress as it affects the owners and occupiers of the land at the present time.

The Archdeacon of Norwich in his charge delivered last May said, "The real question at issue is not only or chiefly one of clerical distress, to maintain the clergy is the duty of the Church, but charged as she thus is with their maintenance, she maintains them, not for their sakes but for her own; the flock is not made for the shepherd, but the shepherd for the flock. When therefore the means of maintaining them are being grievously curtailed by the lamentable decay of a great industry, it becomes imperative upon her to consider how best she can husband the resources that remain to her, what new sources may possibly be available to her."

That there is a lamentable decay in the great agricultural industry generally, and more particularly in the corn growing lands of East Anglia, needs no demonstration. The main cause undoubtedly is the great fall in the money value of all agricultural produce. So far as corn is concerned the fall may be gauged by the value of the tithe-rent charge, which represents approximately the average value of corn for the seven preceding years. Commuted in 1836, the value rose to over £112 in 1875, and fell to under £74 in 1894, the average for the fifty-nine years being just under £99. The margin of profit upon which arable agriculture, in common with every other industry, depends for its maintenance, has been very largely decreased, and in many cases it has been entirely swept away, the inevitable result being that the industry as a whole has been crippled. In some cases farms have been abandoned, and in a vast number more the business has become so unremunerative, that unless relief speedily comes, the cultivation of corn

must be given up. The consequences it is impossible fully to foresee, but this is certain, that it means a very large diminution in the food producing power of this country; and the necessity for dealing with a still more difficult and far-reaching problem, as to what is to become of the agricultural population? If our arable lands are turned over to grass, it is calculated that the labour bill will be reduced from thirty shillings to five shillings per acre, which means that five-sixths of the labourers will be thrown out of work. That the acreage under corn in East Anglia has not decreased in proportion to the decrease in England generally, is to be accounted for by the fact that the soil and climate are not well suited for any alternative system of husbandry with a larger proportion of temporary grasses, nor for the growth of good permanent pasture; it is necessity, not choice, which has kept so large an acreage under the plough; it must not be assumed either, that because farmers have continued to grow corn, that it has paid them to do so—the hope that prices would improve, and the very general desire to keep the labourers employed, are reasons why thousands of acres, which would otherwise have been abandoned, are now under corn. But the time has come when, however desirous the owners and occupiers may be to continue the cultivation of the land, they can afford to do so no longer. Properties which were once valuable as a source of income now yield only a trifling return; they have become a drug in the market, and cannot be sold unless at a sacrifice of from one-half to three-fourths and even more of their value twenty-five years since; the occupiers of the land have lost a large portion of their working capital, and in many cases have become bankrupt. Capital cannot be attracted to any industry unless it is reasonably secure, and offers a fair return for its investment. State advances at a low rate of interest are worse than useless, if the industry is unremunerative. There is, in fact, nothing which can benefit a large section of the agricultural interest, except an immediate and substantial rise in the value of all produce, accompanied by a fair and reasonable reduction in the charges which are now borne by the land. No change in the laws relating to the tenure of the land can alter the economic conditions under which the land is held and cultivated. If corn cannot be grown at present prices, the small holder is in a worse position than the large farmer, the costs being relatively greater. How a substantial rise in prices is to be attained, and with many it is not even desired, is a question which can only be determined by Parliament when the country has definitely expressed an opinion on the subject, it is not one which the Congress can discuss with advantage. But of this there is no doubt, that without a substantial rise in prices, nothing that can be done in the way of a readjustment of the burdens will have any appreciable effect in staving off the ruin which threatens the owner and occupier of our purely arable land.

In dealing with the question of the incidence of tithes as one of the burdens on land, it must first of all be made quite clear that tithes, as such, are, or rather were, not a burden on land at all. Ever since they were first granted they have been a separate property, and formed no part of the estate of the owner of the land, which for many centuries has been bought and sold subject to the charge of tithe. The reason why tithe-payers complain is, that under the name of commuted tithe rent-charge, the tithe-owner now takes a sum which represents more

than a tithe of the produce, and because that sum is in many cases far in excess of the share of the profits which the owner can afford to pay under existing circumstances, if the cultivation of the land is to be maintained. Tithes throughout England vary to a very large extent, as may be seen by referring to the schedule which accompanies this paper, from 6¼d. per acre under crop in Westmoreland to 6s. 9½d. in Kent. In East Anglia the tithe commutation is very high: Norfolk, £280,583, being 5s. 1¾d. per acre; Suffolk, £205,636, being 5s. 3½d. per acre; Essex, £250,278, being 6s. per acre; a total sum of £736,497, or nineteen per cent. of all the tithe in England. The acreage of these three counties being no more than ten per cent. of the whole, it follows that they pay ninety per cent. per acre more than the average of the rest of the country. It would naturally be supposed the tithes being so high, that the value of the produce would be equally high; this unfortunately is not so. It only proves that when the tithes were commuted, corn being regarded as the most valuable portion of agricultural produce, it was made the basis upon which the value was determined. Inasmuch as corn does not now pay to grow, it should no longer be allowed to continue as the basis on which the rent-charge is fixed.

The value of agricultural land at the present time varies enormously; whilst in East Anglia and some of the Southern counties farms go begging and land is being abandoned, in the Midlands and North of England we still hear of keen competition for farms when they become vacant, the tithe-rent charge, however, remains the same, and varies only to the same extent the whole country over. If the interest of the tithe-owner was, as it should be, proportionate to that of the land-owner, the value of the rent-charge would rise and fall in the same degree as the rent. This is what actually took place when tithes were taken in kind. It is because the rent-charge does not rise and fall with the rent that such an anomaly exists, that in many instances tithe is now the only rent produced by the land. The tithe on grass land was commuted at a much lower sum than that on arable; but no provision was made for a re-valuation when arable was turned into grass, or *vice versa*. In districts where good pasture predominates, the incidence of tithe-rent charge is unimportant, whereas on the poorer class of arable land it is now out of all proportion to the profits.

The Tithe Commutation Act, 1836, was an honest attempt to settle a question which had been causing serious difficulty as to the extent and the method of collecting the proportion of the fruits to which the tithe-owner was entitled. It may have been a concession on the part of the tithe-owner, but it must be remembered that in lieu of a tenth of an uncertain amount of produce, an amount which depended absolutely upon the capabilities of each individual farmer, tithe-owners were given a fixed quota of produce as a primary rent-charge, which was made the first charge upon the land. This quota was fixed for all time, and no longer varied with the produce of the particular field or farm, which might or might not be cultivated; owners were induced to concede these terms because they hoped, by a liberal expenditure of capital, to increase their profits. As to the amount expended since 1836 in permanent improvements, such as buildings, drainage, etc., it would be impossible to form anything like an estimate, but in many instances it

now represents a sum far in excess of the present value of the property; estates have been and now are changing hands for sums which do not cover the cost of the bricks and mortar on them, the land itself having not even prairie value. Had it not been for this capital expenditure, the land would not now be in a position to make any return at all. The tithe-owners have had the benefit of this expenditure, but they have not contributed towards it.

The great fault in the Tithe Commutation Act was, that it ignored entirely the possibility that the circumstances and conditions under which the land was cultivated might change; it lost sight of the fact that the value, in consequence of an increase of population and the spread of towns, would in places rise, while on the other hand, the value might fall in consequence of free imports and increased facilities for the shipment of foreign produce. The promoters of the Act assumed, that because prior to 1836 it had paid to grow corn on a particular field or farm, it would always continue to pay to cultivate that particular field or farm; they assumed that prices would be regulated by the supply of home grown produce; they did not foresee that our markets would be controlled by foreign supplies. The commissioners who fixed the value of the tithes based their calculations mainly on corn. Having agreed with the owners as to the total sum to be paid in each parish in lieu of tithes, they divided the amount, apportioning to each field or farm the sum which they considered it ought to bear, according to its corn producing capabilities; this sum, with a view to securing to the tithe-owner an equivalent in value to that which he had given up, and because money was not regarded as sufficiently stable in value, was made to vary according to the price of corn, wheat being calculated at 7s. 0¼d. per bushel; barley, 3s. 11½d.; oats, 2s. 9d. The 1894 values were respectively 2s. 10¼d., 3s. 0¾d., and 2s. 1½d.—a difference of no less than forty-one per cent. in the aggregate values of the two years. It must be evident to anyone that this fall in the money value of corn cannot be met by the owner without a corresponding fall in the cost of production, unless some alternative system of husbandry can be adopted which will give the owner the same return as in 1836. If there is no margin of profit on production, neither tithe or any other charge can be paid. Fortunately corn is not the only product, otherwise the ruin of agriculture would have taken place long ago; other things have helped to make up for the losses sustained in growing corn.

It is argued by some that the tithes having been commuted by Act of Parliament, it is impossible to re-open the question; that it was a bargain, and must be kept to; that in some cases the tithe-owner has been the gainer, in some the loser. I admit the force of this argument, but facts are stronger than theories; if diminished profits make it impossible to continue the cultivation of the land and to pay existing charges, can there be any doubt that the charges, whatever may be their origin, must be reduced rather than the cultivation of the land should be abandoned? But setting aside the question of right, I would ask Churchmen is it politic, is it wise, in the interests of the Church itself, to hinder the re-adjustment of a charge which experience and practice show that if it is maintained on the present basis must be one of the most prominent factors in ruining the Church's best friends? By far the largest portion of the land is owned by supporters of the Church,

who have made, and are now making, great sacrifices to meet the demands of tithe-owners. In many instances tithe-owners are now taking the whole of the available profits, the owner of the land receiving no rent at all. The knowledge that many of the clergy are entirely dependent upon the payment of the tithe, and the desire to maintain the ministrations and usefulness of the Church at a time when she has to repel attack from the Liberationists, acts powerfully on the minds of faithful laymen; it will soon become, however, not a question of will, but of ability on the part of owners to continue paying tithe. As one who earnestly desires the well-being of the Church, I would press upon all the urgent necessity for carrying into effect such an amendment of the Commutation Act as will, while securing to the tithe-owner his just share of the produce—and I do not desire to deprive him of one jot or tittle of his dues—will secure to the owner and occupier such a share of the profits as will fairly remunerate them for their outlay. Nearly sixty years having elapsed since the Commutation Act was passed, is sufficient to account for the change which has come over the agricultural interest; it should not, therefore, be a matter of surprise that in the interests of all concerned, the time has arrived when the incidence of tithes and all other charges upon land must be reconsidered. I see no reason why the primary principle of the payment of tithe should not be re-adopted, and the produce of each individual field or farm made titheable, in the form of a share of the rent, in lieu of a share of the produce. When the owner received, say 30s. an acre as rent, the tithe-owner received about the sum of 6s.; I would suggest, therefore, that the Act be amended, giving the tithe-owner his fair proportion of the gross rent, say one-sixth, and that where there is reason to suppose the owner has not got the best rent possible, or in cases where the owner farms his own land, there shall be an appeal to a properly constituted legal tribunal. If this was done, the rise and fall in agricultural prosperity, whatever it might be, and whatever the system of cultivation adopted, would be shared equitably by land-owner and tithe-owner alike, as it was the intention of the Tithe Commutation Act they should do—the tithe-owner would then get the benefit of any increased value in the land. In East Anglia this would not amount to much, except in the neighbourhood of towns, but in some parts of England this increase would materially help to compensate the Church for losses sustained elsewhere. If this increased value could be invested for the benefit of impoverished benefices, it would go some way to meet the exigencies of parishes where tithes cannot now be paid.

Redemption of tithes by loans advanced by the State, at a low rate of interest, is advocated by some, but personally I hope such a thing may never be carried into effect, for several reasons: *first*, because in the impoverished condition of the land, owners could not borrow the requisite sum with any certain prospect of being able to meet the instalments of capital and interest as they fell due; *next*, because the payment of tithes is a matter which concerns each individual parish, rather than the State as a whole; it is a matter which forms a connecting link between the tithe-payers and their clergy, uniting them in one common interest, for one common purpose; and *lastly*, because tithes, if once they became funded property, would offer a bait which it would be extremely difficult to prevent becoming at some future time a prey

to those who hunger for the sequestration of the Church's endowments. That tithe-owners must suffer in common with land-owners is, under existing circumstances, inevitable; that they have not already done so to the same extent is in a great measure due to the Commutation Act. Where, unfortunately for the clergy, they have had to depend upon tithe farms in lieu of tithes, they have suffered cruelly, a fact which proves only too well the severity of the depression.

In Lord Selborne's "Defence of the Church," it is stated that the amount of tithes in England and Wales is at its par value £4,053,985, of which no less than £962,289, or twenty-three per cent., is in lay hands, leaving £3,091,695 only for ecclesiastical purposes; this, at the current year's value, £73 13s. o½d., is reduced to £2,276,701, an amount which represents about the sum produced by one penny of the Income Tax. That such a sum is more than the agricultural interest can under existing circumstances pay is, I fear, certain, but that it could be raised annually by Churchmen from other sources, I cannot for a moment doubt, if only they would realize the necessity, remembering that personal property now bears no part of the legal charge of maintaining the Church.

Churchmen must recognize the fact that the ancient endowments of the Church are rapidly diminishing, and in places have nearly ceased to exist; that throughout East Anglia generally tithes have become a burden which is a very serious one, a fact which becomes a grave danger to the Church's influence, in the estrangement which it must bring between the Church and the tithe-payers.

The agricultural labourers, though not directly, are very largely concerned in the question; if they have not already suffered to any great extent, the time is coming when they must, and it will be a most lamentable thing if they are induced to believe that it is the payment of tithes, and not the fall in prices, which is the main cause of the abandonment of the cultivation of corn, upon which so large a number of them depend for their daily bread. If the value of landed property has fallen largely in the last few years, the value of all house, funded, and personal property has largely increased. From a return made to the House of Commons this year, it appears that the ratable value of land is now only £33,654,000, a little more than twenty per cent., or one-fifth of the whole, the assessments of buildings being over sixty-three per cent., railways over eight, and other property, including mines, waterworks, canals, etc., being over six per cent. In 1876 the profits in trade were assessed at £490,344,906, in 1892-3 at £597,101,964, an increase of £106,757,058, or twenty-one per cent. The members of the Church who derive their incomes from the land are comparatively few, as compared with those whose incomes are derived from other sources; it is to these that the Church must now look for the help and assistance which she so urgently requires. It is impossible to believe that in wealthy England, Churchmen, knowing the necessities of the Church, will allow her to suffer while they have "enough and to spare." May it never be said of some, that attachment to the Church existed only so long as it entailed no sacrifice on their part, that it ceased when profession had to be accompanied by material support. "The Church of England" will become a misnomer if her members lack the courage and devotion to rally round her in the hour of her need.

SCHEDULE OF TITHE LAND TAX.

RATABLE VALUE, ETC., 1895.

Acres.	County.	Commuted Tithes.			Land Tax.			Total Tithe and Land Tax, 1895		Assessments.			Tithe & Land Tax, per centage of Ratable Value.
			Per Acre.	1895 value at 423 13s 0d.	Quota.	Per Acre.				Lands. Ratable Value, 1894.	Per Acre.		
		£	s. d.	s. d.	£	s. d.		s.	d.	£	s.	d.	
298,494	Bedford ...	23,761	1 10	1 4	28,555	1 10		3	2	299,480	20	0	15%
461,742	Berks ...	88,477	4 8½	3 5	40,844	1 9		5	2	485,812	21	0	24
475,694	Bucks ...	50,977	2 6¼	1 10	47,143	1 11		3	9	451,591	18	11	19
549,565	Cambridge	79,964	3 3	2 4	32,695	1 2		3	6	620,812	22	7	15
655,036	Chester ...	63,589	2 4	1 8	28,599	0 10		2	6	909,296	27	9	[illegible]
868,208	Cornwall ...	101,151	3 4½	2 5	31,943	0 9		3	2	746,689	17	2	18
970,161	Cumberland	26,219	0 9½	0 7	3,714	0 0½		0	7½	647,652	13	4	5
657,550	Derby ...	38,412	1 10½	1 4	24,094	0 8		2	0	593,759	18	0	11
,667,097	Devon ...	181,428	2 11¼	2 2	82,583	0 11		3	1	1,414,482	16	11	18
632,272	Dorset ...	89,183	3 7½	2 7	33,080	1 5		4	0	559,329	17	8	22
647,281	Durham ...	57,374	2 7⅛	1 10	10,598	0 4		2	2	535,866	16	6	13
985,545	Essex ...	250,278	6 0	4 5	89,397	1 9		6	2	788,686	16	0	38
796,731	Gloucester	87,233	2 7⅜	1 11	47,312	1 2		3	1	773,051	19	4	15
537,363	Hereford ...	75,701	3 4⅜	2 6	20,409	0 9		3	3	549,774	20	5	15
406 932	Hertford ...	76,633	4 5⅜	3 3	42,283	2 0		5	3	408,053	20	0	31
233,928	Huntingdon	14,510	1 4¼	1 0	15,497	1 4		2	4	201,165	17	2	13
975,820	Kent... ...	257,875	6 9¼	4 11	82,553	1 8		6	7	1,030,548	21	1	31
1,202,726	Lancaster	73,989	1 9¼	1 3	20,990	0 4		1	7	1,525,103	25	4	6
528,986	Leicester ...	30,956	1 3½	0 11	34,685	1 3		2	2	731,569	27	7	7
1,694,907	Lincoln ...	126,183	1 7¾	1 2	71,907	0 10		2	0	1,663,266	19	7	10
224,488	Middlesex	25,891	4 7	3 4	326,146	29 0		32	4	384,485	34	3	94
347,018	Monmouth	29,917	2 5	1 9	9,812	0 6		2	3	286,984	16	6	13
1,311,525	Norfolk ...	280,583	5 1⅝	3 8	84,307	1 3		4	11	1,195,464	18	2	27
639,541	Northampton ...	32,002	1 1⅛	0 10	47,670	1 5		2	3	684,324	21	4	10
1,289,756	Northumberland	77,537	2 1½	1 6	14,549	0 2		1	8	807,837	12	6	13
539,752	Nottingham ...	130,328	5 9	4 2	27,277	1 0		5	2	656,375	24	3	21
485,322	Oxford	52,873	2 6½	1 10	38,722	1 7		3	5	497,428	20	6	16
97,273	Rutland	8,236	1 10½	1 4	5,525	1 1		2	5	133,592	27	5	8
859,516	Salop	108,693	2 11¼	2 2	29,057	0 8		2	10	1,091,280	25	4	11
1,042,488	Somerset	155,620	3 6¼	2 7	72,473	1 4		3	11	1,475,587	28	3	13
1,037,764	Southampton ...	172,856	4 10	3 6	55,362	1 0		4	6	715,280	13	9	32
749,713	Stafford	75,481	2 5⅜	1 10	26,700	0 8		2	6	964,229	25	8	9
951,291	Suffolk	205,636	5 3½	3 10	73,506	1 6		5	4	775,613	16	3	32
461,230	Surrey	76,300	5 1¾	3 9	66,133	2 10		6	7	381,742	16	6	39
932,733	Sussex	160,373	4 8	3 5	60,048	1 3		4	8	746,310	16	0	29
578,595	Warwick	50,817	2 0¼	1 6	39,790	1 4		2	10	724,077	25	1	11
500,906	Westmoreland...	7,680	0 6¼	0 4	3,045	0 1		0	5	293,798	11	8	3
880,248	Wilts	143,355	3 9½	2 9	49,722	1 1		3	10	692,190	15	8	24
480,342	Worcester ...	64,016	3 1⅜	2 4	35,518	1 5		3	9	558,763	23	3	16
753,644	York E.	43,620	1 3½	0 11	}					713,421			
1,360,925	,, N.	87,362	2 0	1 6	} 91,494	0 5		1	6	883,624	16	9	9
1,773,782	,, W.	90,730	1 5¾	1 1	}					1,622,570			
18,543,890		£3,873,799	2 4	1 8	£1,945,737	1 2		2	10	£31,220,956	19	2	14

tal of Land and Water; Agricultural Returns, 1893.
Tithes; Royal Commission. H. Pringle.
A. Society, 1893. E. R. Pratt.
lue of Lands; House of Commons Returns, 5th April, 1895.

RATABLE VALUE OF LANDS, 1895.

MEMORANDUM BY MR. G. SHAW-LEFEVRE, M.P., PRESIDENT LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

"For the whole of England and Wales, it appears that the ratable value of property assessed in 1870 was £104,870,000, while that for 1894 was £161,081,000, an increase of £56,211,000, or fifty-three per cent.

"The rateable value of land, however, owing to the agricultural depression of the past few years, has been considerably reduced in the interval, and the proportion of it to the value of other property has been greatly diminished. In 1870 the ratable value of land was £39,835,000, or considerably more than one-third of the whole ratable value of the property then assessed for local taxation. The ratable value of buildings was then £55,157,000, or rather more than one-half of all ratable property. Railways were then assessed at £4,871,000, or about one twenty-second, and other property at £5,006,000, or about one twenty-first part of the whole.

"In the twenty-four years which have elapsed since 1870, the ratable value of land has been reduced by £6,180,000, or 15·5 per cent., and the total ratable value of land is now only £33,654,000, or 20·9 per cent., a little more than one-fifth of the whole. The assessments of buildings have increased by £47,504,000, or eighty-six per cent., and they are now 63·7 per cent. of the whole. Railways have increased by £9,000,000, or 184·8 per cent., and their ratable value now stands at 8·6 per cent., or about one-twelfth of the whole; and other property, including mines, waterworks, canals, etc., has increased by £5,887,000, or 117·6 per cent., and now stands at 6·8 per cent. of the whole, or about one-fifteenth."

"The reduction has varied very much in different parts of the country. It has been greatest in the Eastern Counties. In Essex the reduction since 1879 has been 39·1 per cent.; in Suffolk, 38·1; Wiltshire, 35·1; Huntingdon, 33·3; Berkshire, 32·6; Norfolk, 31·1; Oxford, 30·8; Cambridge, 30·2. In the counties of Bedford, Buckingham, Dorset, Gloucester, Hereford, Hertford, Kent, Leicester, Lincoln, Northampton, Northumberland, Nottingham, Rutland, Southampton, Sussex, Warwick, Worcester, and York, the reduction has been from twenty to thirty per cent. In Cumberland, Derbyshire, Devon, Durham, Lancashire, Middlesex, Monmouth, Salop, Somerset, Stafford, Surrey, and Westmoreland, it has been from ten to twenty per cent.; and in Cheshire and Cornwall under ten per cent."

"These per centage reductions do not show the full reduction in value of purely agricultural land in rural districts. There is a large extent of land in agricultural counties near to towns which has not lost its value to the same extent as other land. There is also much pasture land of the best quality which has either maintained its value or lost but little."

"A point of importance brought out clearly by the return is that in spite of the fall in the value of land, and the great increase of population, there has been a general increase in the proportion of ratable value of property to the population. There are only seven counties where there has been a slight reduction of ratable value in proportion to population, viz.: Essex, Lincoln, Norfolk, Northampton, Suffolk, Wilts, and York (East Riding)."

ADDRESS.

CLARE SEWELL READ, Esq., Hovingham, Norwich.

MR. SANCROFT HOLMES, as the President of the Norfolk Chamber of Agriculture, has earned the gratitude of every Norfolk farmer for collecting and tabulating that fearful array of facts and figures which prove to demonstration the immensity of distress which prevails in this county. When the Central Chamber of Agriculture took up the inquiry, and extended it to the whole of England, it was found that agricultural distress did prevail, more or less, everywhere, but in no instance was it so keen or so much felt as in the corn-growing districts of East Anglia. Now I am afraid that the majority of this great nation do not appreciate or do not know of the impending ruin of the agricultural interest. A good many, I fear, are saying this, that as long as food is cheap, it does not signify if our greatest and our oldest industry is ruined. They tell us that we must still buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market. Very good I wish we could all sell in the dearest market, but that, I fear, is prohibited by hostile tariffs. As for buying in the cheapest market, foreign agricultural produce is bought in markets that are not naturally, but artificially cheap. There is gambling in wheat, for instance. There are the bounties which Colonial and Foreign Governments give upon agricultural exports. And there is this great fact, that the British sovereign is worth in the Argentine currency forty-five shillings, and is worth, I think, something like thirty-six shillings in Indian rupees. Unless we have war—which God forbid—or unless the mines of South Africa pour forth a golden stream which shall augment prices—for there is no doubt the discovery of gold in California and Australia did raise prices in the early days of free trade—unless that happens, then I think that arable agriculture, as we now pursue it, is doomed. You cannot possibly believe that the English farmers can produce wheat at four shillings a bushel, but we have to sell it at three shillings a bushel ; grinding barley at two shillings and sixpence a bushel ; and oats at one shilling and ninepence a bushel ; which is now the price. When we talk about what Parliament may do for agriculture, I say that the most friendly and sympathising Government can do no more than this, that it can procure for us, possibly, pure beer ; revise our railway rates, and it must relieve the land from those unjust burdens which have been heaped upon it. We must see also that the realized wealth of the country contributes more justly to our local taxation.

Mr. Henry Rew, the Secretary of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, has recently presented his report on Norfolk agriculture to the Royal Commission on Agriculture, and he notes the unequal pressure of the tithe-rent charge in different districts. He says : "It is an anomaly that the burden falls most heavily where depression is greatest, and most lightly where the land has fallen least in value." The excellent table which Mr. Sancroft Holmes adds to his valuable paper proves this, that Norfolk pays more tithe than any county in England ; and if he had extended his inquiry to Wales, he would have found that Norfolk pays more tithe than the whole of the twelve Welsh counties. And here I would observe that, whereas the main produces of the Welsh farmer—store cattle, sheep, and milk—have hardly fallen at all in value, yet the tithe-rent charge which he has to pay has been reduced twenty-six per cent., mainly in consequence of the depression in the value of wheat, which we grow and he does not. I say, then, that if he was so dishonest as to repudiate the bargain he had made, and resisted the payment of this small impost, I believe I should be right in saying that the old nursery rhyme is true, that

" Taffy was a Welshman,
Taffy was a thief."

Mr. Sancroft Holmes has said that he thinks the time has arrived when there ought to be a revision of the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836. Suppose, for instance, that instead of the tithes being commuted sixty years ago, they were commuted one hundred years ago. Arthur Young tells us that at the end of last century Norfolk did not grow sufficient wheat to maintain its inhabitants, and the chief products of the West were rye and rabbits. Kent, who wrote a report to the old Board of Agriculture in 1795, said that the tithes of Norfolk were something like three shillings an acre. Mr. R. N. Bacon —whom we used to call "Mercury Dick" in my young days—stated that in 1841 the tithes in Norfolk were six shillings and eightpence an acre. Anyhow, it came to pass that in those forty years the tithe was doubled, and the tithe-owner did not contribute a single shilling towards that enormous rise. It was chiefly due to the capital expended by landlords, and the energy and skill of the tenantry. That, I think, proves that the time has almost arrived when, if Lord Leicester is right in thinking that the land of Norfolk must return to temporary or permanent pasture, the basis on which the tithe should be paid should be grass rather than corn, or else, agreeing with Mr. Sancroft Holmes, it should be a fair proportion of the rent.

One other observation on this point. Tithes were commuted in the days of protection, and there is no doubt that then the consumer paid a large proportion of the tithe. You may say—We have had high prices for corn under free trade, sometimes higher than those we had in the days of protection. It was one of the advantages of the sliding scale that when corn was dear our ports were open; but when corn was low, the import duty prevented it being ruinously low, as in these last few years; and I think that now the full burden of the tithe falls unreservedly on the land of England, but with crushing severity upon the wheat and bean lands of East Anglia.

Do not suppose for one moment that I do not sympathize most deeply with the poor rural vicar. His slender stipend has been reduced more than one-fourth, and if the prices which now prevail continue a few years, his £100 of rent charge will be worth only £65. I sympathize also with him in the altered condition of his parish. The hall is empty, the farmhouses often tenanted by working bailiffs, the cottages are dilapidated, and many of them are empty; the labourers are impoverished and dissatisfied. Yet these clergy, with their slender and decreasing means, unaided and alone—for often they have no one in the parish who is rich enough to help them—are expected to adminster to the spiritual wants, and even the temporal necessities, of the poorest of the inhabitants.

Now, Churchmen all over the country have congratulated themselves on the result of the last General Election, and have said with truth that the Church in Parliament is much stronger than it has been there for years. I cannot congratulate the county of Norfolk in that respect. If you exclude the boroughs, and take only our county agricultural M.P.'s, the support of the Church is about as much from Norfolk as in Wales—that is to say, two-thirds of our county members are bound to vote in favour of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. And to what is this mainly due? Mainly to the hostility of the country agricultural labourer. And why? I say his hostility is political and industrial rather than religious. It may be that the modern mode of conducting the Church Services in our rural districts are not appreciated and not understood by some of our country population. I do not refer to the cases where the doctrine of the Church of Rome is preached, and the rites of high ritualism are practised, but I refer to the honest, zealous, godly members of our Church—the clerics who monotone the services, and who introduce dismal Gregorian chants, and other tuneless, high-class music in which the congregation cannot join. But I fear that the worst feature is, that when the rural labourer forsakes his parish church, he seldom goes anywhere else. In his present circumstances the labourer must be discontented. He

sees perfectly well what is happening. He knows his wages have been decreased to the beggarly sum of ten shillings a week, and will probably in the short days of winter fall to nine shillings, and he knows that if this agricultural distress continues, half of them will have to leave the country and migrate to the towns. In other counties the labourers have joined the landlords and farmers in endeavouring to improve the condition of agriculture. But in this county, unfortunately, they have been told that the easiest way to benefit agriculture is to get rid of the landlord and of the farmer and of the parson. This is what Mr. Arch wrote, not in the heat of an election contest, but in the calm atmosphere of the "New Review." The member for North-West Norfolk there says: "The farmer is a selfish, stubborn, stupid animal. The labourer alone has the right to live off the land, parasites must go." And he points out that the chief parasite is the parson. But the agricultural labourer, although he is prone to believe any proposal that is to his advantage, was cute enough to see that if he got rid of both the tithes and the parson the parish would be the poorer, and that would do him no good; so they altered the cry to "appropriate the tithes for the payment of old age pensions within the parish." That caught him and his vote. However, there is one crumb of comfort in this predatory and sacrilegious proposition. It enables you to get rid of the idea that tithe is national property. They now contend it belongs to the parish. We say the same; but while we believe that it is for the spiritual benefit of every parishioner, they would make it out to be only for the secular advantage of the poor. I would conclude by repeating words used by the late John Bright—"The people, upon the whole, are a good people; and if those who claim to be their leaders speak the truth to them, all will be well; but if they do not, God help them both."

PAPERS.

(2) Remedies.

(*a*) National Church Sustentation Fund.

The Very Rev. William Lefroy, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

The chronic, widespread, and penetrating poverty of the parochial clergy of the wealthiest religious society in Christendom is an accepted fact. This condition is not especially theirs. It belongs to some of the most learned men in Europe, who are members of our ancient universities, and who have given their lives to the advancement of science and literature. It is shared by many members of our cathedral chapters. I do not intend to suggest remedial measures for fellows of colleges, or for deans or canons. All I have to submit shall be concerned with the parochial clergy. They are the most patient sufferers in this great nation. Their wives and daughters are unwearied, and even heroic, in their unrequited and often unrecognized toil. I believe these do more work for God and for man than all the sisters in all the world put together. These fifty thousand ladies are amongst the saviours of England. They share with the clergy the agonies of want. As poor, they make many rich. They wage a holy war against ignorance, dirt, degradation, sin. They are faint, but they pursue, for the tender might of a holy woman's love knows neither limit nor failure. The hard times press on them most heavily. Nor is there one sign of alleviation.

The causes of the pressure are many. But the main cause is the ruin

which has come upon the landed interest, by which farms are derelict, rents are reduced or unpaid, tithes have shrunk by twenty-four per cent., glebes have fallen one-half in value, while taxation increases, and the claims made in a hundred ways on the resident clergy are as numerous as ever. These facts are admitted. England—whose people still believe in the Established Church—has now to face the humiliations which are represented by an impoverished clergy. We are here to-day to submit a scheme for the incorporation of a National Church Sustentation Fund, by which the prevailing distress may be alleviated.

There are three modes in which a sustentation fund may be worked. The first of these is by the provision of a large sum as capital, the interest of which would be administered annually. When I tell you that I propose to raise £1,000,000 a year, it will be seen that at least two objections lie against this scheme. One is the enormous amount of distress which would be unrelieved while such a huge capital sum was being raised. Another is that each generation should do its own work, and we ought never to forget the moral benefit which accrues to givers from systematic and proportionate almsgiving as compared with the lesser benefit which accrues from larger but occasional giving. The second mode is already in happy operation in the one diocese in England which, through the work of the bishop and the confidence which the laity have in him, possesses the three features essential to successful parochial work and an adequately sustained ministry. The diocese of Liverpool is the only diocese in England in which every parish has (*a*) its mission or parochial room; in which there is (*b*) a Pension Fund, founded by Mrs. Chas. Turner, from which a clergyman may, provided he has served fifteen years in the diocese, receive as much as £200 a year; and in which, too, there is (*c*) a Sustentation Fund. This is gathered largely from the contributions of the mercantile class. It is administered, without regard to theological view, and without exposing the applicant to the pain and humiliation of having his statement as to income signed by either the rural dean or the archdeacon. The names of grantees are never published. The grant is made annually. The cheque is sent half-yearly. The poor livings have been increased in the three years in which the scheme has been at work from £235 to £250, £260, and this year to £275. The bishop, with the committee, have every hope that next year no vicar or incumbent of a large parish will have less than £300 a year. No return is asked from any of the parishes whose clergy are aided. The third mode is a modification of the Liverpool plan. It obtains in the archdiocese of York. The object of the fund is to raise the value of poor benefices to £200 a year. The method of this operation is to offer, from funds with which the committee is intrusted, a grant of £20 to every one of the poor benefices on the condition that this grant be met by an equal sum collected from local sources, thus raising the value of the benefice by £40. This plan has worked well so far, but its weakness appears in the fact that the principal out of which the grants are made is mainly composed of large contributions which are limited by a few years, and, although in existence but two years, this sum has already declined. I am persuaded this plan is too narrow in its scope, too exacting in its condition, too uncertain in its result. It would utterly fail to cope with the vastness of the suffering which must be remedied, especially in agricultural parishes. We must

have a scheme which, while welcoming the larger contributions of the opulent, will rely mainly on the smaller contributions, systematic and definite, of the masses. The sustentation fund should be made a vital, permanent, and universal feature of our parochial machinery. It should be established in every church and in every mission-room. No exception to this will be taken by those who recognize the readiness of the poor to help according to their power, the importance of uniting the people and the pastorate in the cement of sympathetic and mutual service, and the solemn obligation by which every minister of Jesus Christ is bound to inculcate the duty of proportionate giving. With regard to this latter, the corporate confession of the Church must be—"We have left undone those things which we ought to have done."

The figures submitted by Dr. Pigott, the devoted secretary of the Poor Clergy Corporation—a man who has brought thousands of pounds into the coffers of his society, and whose wife and daughter are literally slaves in their extraordinary devotion to suffering parsondom—are harrowing, but inspiring; 400 beneficed clergy receive less than £50 a year; 3.500 less than £100 a year; 7,000 less than £130 a year. To raise these pittances to £200 a year all round £900,000 are required; let us call it £1,000,000 a year. At first sight this is a large sum, and will continue to appear so as long as we look at the figures only, or look at them from an individual, parochial, local, or diocesan point of view. But look at the amount in the light of the love of the people of England; look at it as a sum to be raised in our 14,055 parishes; as collected from 5,477,321 inhabited houses; or as subtracted from our £1,000,000,000 of annual earnings; as withdrawn from our £235,000,000 of annual hoardings. Then its otherwise large dimensions become shaped by reason, limited by comparison, probable by the generosities of religion, and certain by the systematic activities of organization in the fear of God. Remember the annual income of the Sustentation Fund of the Free Church of Scotland is £171,000 a year. That of the Salvation Army is £800,000. One week of self-denial is worth £10,000. With these facts staring the Church and the nation in the face, let every tongue be dumb that would argue against the possibility of raising £1,000,000 a year for the starving clergy of that Church which the empire has just declared shall neither be denied her work nor deprived of her property.

To provide this sum, every parish should have its Sustentation Fund Council. Its members should be nominated by communicants, or, these failing, by parishioners being Churchmen. Churchwardens, sidesmen, lay-helpers should be welcomed as members. Guided by the incumbent, the parish should be divided into sections, each section being committed to a member of the council, whose loving labour it would be to call weekly on every churchman in his section for his contribution to the fund, and to remit his gatherings monthly to the parochial treasurer, together with the names of the donors. Three stages of canvassing may be commended. I should begin with the communicants, proceed to other members of the congregation, and advance to parishioners. The amount to be contributed ought to be regulated by the individual conscience, "according as God hath prospered him." It ought, moreover, to be gathered, as it ought to be devoted, weekly. Parochial publication of personal offerings should be prohibited. The

treasurer should remit quarterly the parochial contribution to the diocesan authority, who would be the treasurer for each rural deanery or archdeaconry. It will be seen that local collections are not intended to relieve local needs. There are many reasons in favour of this. Of them all I accentuate two; one is the transcendent importance of preserving the moral delicacy and the spiritual independence of the parish priest. The other is the initiation and fostering of inter-diocesan sympathy. My plea is that well-to-do dioceses should help the poorer. Each Diocesan Sustentation Fund should be a branch of the National Church Sustentation Fund. Here we must recognize a contingency. The spiritual independence of the pastor is sometimes at the expense of the spiritual rights of the people, and the converse of the statement is equally true. It is conceivable, ay, it is certain, there are laity who would decline, on grounds of conscience and of principle, to sustain a clergyman whose teaching was, in their opinion, heretical. The forty men and more who swore "they would neither eat nor drink till they had slain Paul" have their lineal descendants in those who appear to have made a somewhat similar vow. They dare not slay their pastor. They will only starve him. This is done on both sides. Since it is, I plead for the principle of appropriation. I believe that every contributor has a right to apply his gift, be it large or little, to whomsoever, as in the sight of God, he thinks fit Yet I believe in a larger right, and in a lovelier generosity. The good Samaritan is Christ's own illustration of the charity that should triumph over fiercer feuds than those which divide English Churchmen.

Before I proceed to submit the lines on which apportionment may run, I will now suppose the scheme at work, and to some extent successful. I do not in the least expect that all our parishes would at once fall in. But I am certain that, authoritatively, persuasively, and Episcopally launched, a good start might soon be made, and in a very few years nearly all the available ground would be covered, by the continued influences of prayer, diligence, oversight, and unyielding perseverance. And it is partly because I believe this that I place before you a very simple ideal—reasonable, workable, probable.

The population of England and Wales is, say, thirty millions. There are about one million persons receiving poor relief, and no more, even if we include ten thousand as representing the criminal classes. I allow a million for the unemployed, which leaves twenty-eight millions as the estimated remnant. I do not forget the sympathy of the Church with all. I do not ignore the existence of others who work independently of us. But I am content, for the purposes of my estimate, with one-fourth of these as the material on which the Church has actually to work. I estimate their income as £250,000,000 a year, and their annnal savings as £58,000,000. Let each of the seven millions be supposed to contribute one penny weekly. The result would be a sustentation fund of £1,516,666 per annum—in round numbers, one million and a half a year. Many would give much more and at once. Few would give less. Each diocesan sustentation fund and the National Church Sustentation Fund should be incorporated under the Board of Trade. Donations unappropriated could be received by each diocesan branch. But if they were given to the National Church Sustentation Fund, they could be applied by the bishops to meet the needs of the poorer dioceses. These

would materially aid the fund. By systematic, but gradual, investment, some provision could be made against such contingencies as are certain to affect the fund, such as strikes, prolonged depression, sickness, or scarcity. But welcome as such aid would be, wise as it would assuredly be to accumulate where it is possible, worthy as it would be for a wealthy centre or centres to help the poorer before the distribution was finally made, the staple factor of the Sustentation Fund should be the smaller contributions gathered from a wide and extended area.

We now come to the conditions upon which the fund should be administered, and the constitution of the board by which that work should be done. With regard to the former, these conditions must be framed by each diocese. The dioceses in the north and in the midlands differ, parochially, both as regards population and income from those in the east and in the south. In the diocese of Norwich there are upwards of 1,000 benefices. Of these only twenty-eight have populations over 4,000, excluding Great Yarmouth. In Liverpool there are but 204 benefices, of these 137 are over 4,000. It is obvious the numerical conditions which are applicable to Liverpool would be inapplicable to Norwich. Differences of another kind must be recognized, such as the dispersion of the people in rural, compared with their congestion in urban districts, the wear and tear of life in a crowded centre as contrasted with its comparative ease in sparsely peopled parishes, not forgetting how much less £1 is in the country than in the town. This variety of condition renders it impossible to apply a common standard, numerical or physical, or moral, as that by which the fund should be administered. Each diocese should have its own, and should admit of being revised every three or five years. The one imperative postulate of the scheme is that no beneficed clergyman should be in want, and, while I plead for the existence of a parochial sustentation fund in every parish in the land, it is unnecessary to say that application for help should be made by those who needed it. Its bestowal should commence with the smallest incomes, should bring these up to, say, £100 a year. This done, those with the latter should be brought up to £150, until synchronously with the increasing parochial extension of the fund every benefice would have £200 a year.

Here, let me say, certain regulations to safeguard the application of the fund and to encourage imperative and urgent reform will be necessary. Amongst these we may surely include the principle that nothing should be done which would be likely to postpone the union of small benefices. Under-work is a greater peril to the clergy than under-pay. Once again the utmost care should be taken to avoid such an administration of the fund as would render livings in private patronage more marketable than they are. Church funds should never be used to improve private property. And yet, again, when new parishes are formed out of old ones, they, as far as possible, should be endowed out of the revenues of the mother Church before resorting to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. This has been somewhat disregarded. Would it not be wise for the Commissioners to revise all the grants they have made every few years? The discovery of abuses might enable them to pass on grants to needy parishes from those to which they never should have been made, and to re-endow such parishes out of the revenues of the mother church. Moreover, this scheme requires for the laity a

larger share in the selection, appointment, and continuance of their pastors than they have yet enjoyed. I do not believe this is essential to the scheme. I am persuaded it would be for its advantage.

As to the constitution of the Diocesan Sustentation Board, history, reason, and the nature of things combine to place the bishop at its head. A board for each archdeaconry suggests the presence of each archdeacon, and, according to the numerical strength of the archdeaconry, an elective body chosen from representatives of each parochial Sustentation Fund Council. The duties of the archidiaconal board should be to gather and to account for the united gatherings of all the parishes in the archdeaconry; to receive and to sift applications for aid; to recommend grants; yet only provisionally, until the bishops of each province, under the presidency of the Archbishop, compared results, as presented to the National Church Sustentation Fund by the bishops. Then if necessary and possible, poorer dioceses should be aided by the gatherings of the richer ones. This undone, and a series of diocesan sustentation funds may succeed, but the larger and nobler scheme of a National Church Sustentation Fund must fail. This done—and the recommendation of the bishops should be final—the apportionment should be made on Sustentation Day. It should be marked by sacred services. Life and light and love should be at their highest. There should be then the joy of the harvest of holy self-sacrifice.

The initiation of this work lies upon the bishops. They cannot escape it even if they would. But should they shrink or refuse, they cannot but be inspired by one impressive fact, for which I, for one, have thanked God upon every remembrance of it. It is associated with the victory with which God has crowned the arduous and exhausting labours of our great archbishop. His Grace has saved the empire from a possible relapse to semi-paganization. He has saved, he is saving, he shall save the children of the working classes from being defrauded of the most sacred birthright of a soul, which is the truth and the whole truth; he has saved thousands of parish-rooms to continue to represent the social side of the Church's work; he has, in part, saved the nation from an act of folly, of madness, of sin. His Grace has done this by quickening the pulse of 7,000 parishes with love of Church and with love of country. In doing this our great archbishop has taught the Church something of her strength. Shall we not now go forward? Shall we not use the organization of the 7,000 parishes to start, and at once, the National Church Sustentation Fund? The Church is ready for it. The nation expects it The opportunity is such as neither Church nor nation has had for centuries.

(*b*) Union of Small Benefices and other remedies.

The Honourable Edward P. Thesiger, C.B., Chairman of the Clergy Pension Institution.

Two facts render the consideration of the subject of the union of neighbouring parishes for ecclesiastical purposes peculiarly appropriate at the present time. The first fact is the diminution in the number of candidates for ordination. In 1894 the number of deacons who were

ordained in the various dioceses of England and Wales amounted to only 684, this being the smallest total in any of the years between 1881 and 1894, which are the years for which such statistics are given in the "Official Year Book of the Church of England," and no less than 130 less than were ordained in 1886, when the total of new ordinees reached 814. But this fact becomes of still graver import when we remember that the population of England and Wales has increased during the past ten years by more than 3,000,000, and that this fact, startling as it is, does not fully represent the number of additional souls to be cared for. For it is the tendency of the present population, owing to the decreased demand for agricultural labour, caused by the more general use of machinery in farm work, and owing also to a general desire for more intellectual and higher paid employment, to leave the country parishes and migrate to the towns, and so an even greater demand is made on the resources of the Church than might be inferred from the large increase in the population of this country, remarkable as it has been.

The consideration of the best mode of increasing the supply of clergy is a subject well worthy of the attention of a Church Congress; but it is not the point of view from which I have been asked to discuss to-day the advisability of having a larger recourse to the union of neighbouring benefices as a remedy for the present distress, and I must not do more than make this slight reference to it.

The other fact, then, and the one on the lines of which the discussion is to proceed this morning, and which seems to me to bring the union of benefices within the range of practical politics, is the alarming and wholly unexpected decrease in the value of benefices in the present day, brought about, in the first place, by the severe agricultural distress through which this land is passing, resulting in almost every case in the reduction of the rent of glebe lands by an average of at least fifty per cent., and in many cases in rendering them unlettable at any rent at all; and brought about, in the second place, by the great fall in the price of wheat, which has reduced the value of tithe rent-charge, which once stood at nearly 112, to less than 74 in the present year. Of the dire distress that in consequence exists, no one who has had any experience of Church patronage, as it was my privilege or misfortune to have for a good many years, can entertain the slightest doubt.

Those who have to do with the administration of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Distress Fund, through the agency of the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy, could give numberless heartrending instances of clergymen who in past years were in the enjoyment of a sufficient, if not munificent, income, now reduced, through no fault of their own, to a constant consideration of how to make two ends meet, and at the same time do justice to the needs of the parish of which they have been placed in spiritual charge. Some remedy, therefore, seems necessary for the present state of things. It would be unreasonable to expect any man to work on an income too small to supply the bare necessaries of life. The supply of clergymen with sufficient private means to render them independent of the income of their benefices must necessarily be limited, and the ultimate issue will be that, unless some remedy be found, the number of those offering themselves for ordination will be still further reduced, and the spiritual welfare of the whole country will suffer. It is true that much can be done by private munificence. A

return moved for by the first Lord Hampton, better known as Sir John Pakington, showed that between the years 1840 and 1874 no less a sum than £25,500,000 was contributed towards the building, rebuilding, and restoration of churches, while from that time up to 1892 a further sum of more than £20,000,000 has been subscribed for a like purpose, so that it is no doubt true that during the last fifty years at least £50,000,000 have been raised by voluntary contributions. In this way some attempt, and that a not inconsiderable one, has been made to keep abreast of the increase of the population in the matter of church accommodation. But while this enormous sum has been raised for church building purposes, resulting in the provision of 698 new churches in the last ten years, no corresponding effort has been made to provide adequate stipends for the clergy who are to serve them, or for the compensation of those clergymen who, through the causes which I have mentioned, have seen their incomes reduced by more than half. For instance, in 1894 the amount contributed for church building or restoration amounted to £1,182,435, while the sum contributed for endowment was only £176,346, and towards the erection of parsonage houses only £87,920.

While recognizing, therefore, fully the devoted spirit which has prompted the making of the House of God a worthy sanctuary for His worship, I cannot help wishing that an equal sum could have been subscribed towards making the stipends of His ministers more adequate to the duties which they are called upon to perform. Until, however, this happy result is attained by the raising of a large Sustentation Fund, administered for the benefit of the Church at large by a representative council of Churchmen, a fact which I hope to live to see realized, we must be content to make use of the machinery already existing in order to meet the distress occasioned by the serious reduction which has taken place in the incomes of the clergy. One method by which this result can be attained is, undoubtedly, the more extensive use of the power which already exists for the union of small benefices.

Such a union can be effected under existing legislation in two ways.

The Pluralities Act of 1838, while protesting, as it was bound to protest, against the scandal of a clergyman holding in plurality five or six benefices or other preferments in different parts of the country, and, while enjoying the emoluments of these several preferments, performing the duties of them through the means of an ill-paid curate, a scandal which was perfectly common even sixty years ago, recognizes that in certain circumstances, such as nearness of the two parishes, smallness of their population, or insufficiency of the income, a union of two benefices may be for the temporal advantage of the incumbent of such benefices, and not detrimental to the spiritual needs of their inhabitants, and gives the Archbishop of Canterbury power to grant to a clergyman a dispensation to hold two benefices in plurality where the distance of the respective churches of such parishes is not greater than four miles, and the value of one of the benefices does not exceed £200 a year. In this way two benefices can be *temporarily* united, the Archbishop retaining the power to withdraw such dispensation, or to decline to renew it, in the event of a vacancy occurring in such benefices.

But benefices can be united in a more formal and permanent manner by means of the Act 1 and 2 Vict., c. 106, known as the Union of

Benefices Act. Under its provisions any two or more contiguous benefices, of which the aggregate population shall not exceed one thousand five hundred persons, may, on the representation of the bishop or bishops of the dioceses in which such benefices are situated, and with the consent of the patron or patrons of such benefices, be united by means of an Order in Council on the application of the archbishop of the province.

The existing law, therefore, provides in a sufficiently satisfactory manner for the union of such benefices as may, in my opinion, be held together without any real injury to the spiritual welfare of the inhabitants of such parishes; and I should not be inclined to urge the extension of this principle beyond its present limits. I should, however, be disposed to recommend a more frequent use of the provisions of these Acts as a remedy for the present distress. But as I trust that this distress may be temporary, or that it may in the future be met and relieved by some other means, such as the establishment of a sustentation fund, to which I have already referred, I should be of opinion that a temporary union under the Pluralities Act would, as a rule, be preferable to the more rigid, and, to a greater extent, irrevocable union under the provisions of the Union of Benefices Act. It may well happen that some wealthy parishioner, anxious to secure for his parish the undivided services of a resident clergyman, may provide such an addition to the income of the benefice as may render the union of two ill-endowed benefices no longer necessary; and such a union would be terminated with much greater facility if they have been merely held together under the archbishop's dispensation, than if an Order in Council had converted them into a single parish for ecclesiastical purposes.

In urging that a more frequent recourse should be had to the provisions of the Pluralities Act, I have no desire to see even the smallest return to the state of things which existed before this Act was passed. It was stated at that time, and the statement was, as far as I know, uncontradicted, that in 1837, out of 10,570 clergymen, no less than 5,425, or somewhat more than half, were non-resident in their parishes. There were 1,856 cases of clergymen holding two benefices in plurality, 412 holding three benefices, 57 holding four, and three cases of a clergyman holding five benefices at the same time; and so great was the sense of the scandal which then existed, that a strenuous opposition was waged against the passing of the Pluralities Act, because it gave a legal sanction to, and recognized the desirability in certain cases of a clergyman being non-resident in a parish of which he had the spiritual charge. But I have no fear that in the present day the power of holding two benefices in plurality will be exercised to an injurious extent. The higher sense of duty towards his parishioners which is now felt by almost every clergyman would prevent the desire to undertake the ministration of two parishes when it was clear that the result of such ministration could not, in the circumstances of the case, be thoroughly satisfactory; while the power of the archbishop to withhold his dispensation provides a safeguard in the few cases where a want of a due appreciation of the needs of the parishes in question might have led the patron to consider that they would be adequately served by one incumbent.

But it is now necessary to consider a little more closely how such a

union of benefices would affect the position and privileges of the parishioners. However anxious we may be to improve the condition of the clergy by providing them with an income on which they may live without that anxiety which cannot but impair the efficiency of their parish work, we must not forget that the income of the benefice exists primarily, not for the benefit of its incumbent, but for the spiritual advantage of the parishioners to whom he ministers. It has been the pride and boast of the Church of England that almost every parish in this country, however isolated, however thinly populated, has its resident incumbent, to whom everyone may turn in his difficulties and trials, and who is the friend and servant of all his parishioners; and I should be loth to recommend anything that would deprive the meanest parish of the efficient ministrations of a clergyman. It is, therefore, only because I believe that a judicious union of benefices would increase rather than diminish the efficiency of such ministrations that I urge its more general adoption. Without in any way accusing the clergy of having a too great regard to the income of their benefices, it is not in human nature that a living of the value of £100 a year, or less, should attract as efficient a clergyman as one of £250 or £300. It is therefore surely better for a parish to have the more occasional services of an entirely efficient clergyman, living a few miles off in a neighbouring village, rather than enjoy the benefit of a resident clergyman who has been perhaps induced to accept the benefice from the difficulty he finds in obtaining a suitable curacy, or who is compelled to add to the entirely inadequate income by taking pupils, or by engaging in some other extra-parochial work, which really limits his ministry to his parishioners to a greater extent than the joint superintendence of two contiguous benefices. And we must not, I think, lose sight of the deadening effect which the pastoral charge of a parish with a very small population and income must exercise on the spirits of a zealous energetic clergyman. With every desire to spend and be spent on behalf of his flock, however small that flock may be, his energies cannot fail to be damped, and his ministerial efficiency weakened, if the size of his parish does not give him fair scope for the exercise of his powers. So that it seems to me that two parishes are often better served by one clergyman, whose time would be fully employed, than if they had each its separate incumbent rusting away for want of sufficient work.

I do not ignore the preference which every parish entertains for a resident incumbent. It is the main difficulty in carrying out any union of benefices. When I was secretary of presentations to the Lord Chancellor, we had to consider many suggestions for holding benefices in plurality. In almost every case there was little opposition from the inhabitants of the parish in which, after such union, it was proposed that the clergyman should reside; but very strenuous objections were urged by the inhabitants of the other parish, which would, as a consequence of such union, lose the privilege of a resident incumbent. It is a very natural feeling. It is the certainty that the Disendowment of the Church, whether in England or Wales, would render it nearly, if not quite, impossible that this system should be continued, that affords one among many reasons for opposing this spoliation to the death; but I still believe that by proceeding on the very moderate lines of the Pluralities Act, an economy of money and men may be effected without

detriment to the welfare of the parishes dealt with under its provisions. I cannot help thinking sometimes that church-going in this country is made almost too easy, and that the privilege would be more highly valued if it were somewhat more difficult of attainment. Be this as it may, it can surely not be considered any great hardship if the inhabitants of one parish, being provided with, at any rate one service on Sundays in their own church, should be called upon to walk a few miles to a neighbouring parish church for a second or third service. I do not propose this as an ideal state of things—that is attained, undoubtedly, by the parochial system, which provides a resident clergyman in every parish—but as a remedy for the present distress; and where the income is wholly inadequate for the maintenance of a clergyman in decent comfort, or where the population is so small as not to be likely to attract the services of a really efficient pastor, the alternative may, I think, be beneficially adopted of uniting two benefices under the spiritual charge of one incumbent. This union can, as I have already said, be more wisely effected, as a rule, under the provisions of the Pluralities Act. We all trust that the present agricultural depression may pass away, that prices may improve, and that the value of tithe rent-charge may rise; and in this hope it would seem better that the question should be open for reconsideration when a subsequent vacancy in the benefice may occur. If this union has merely been effected by means of a dispensation from the Archbishop of Canterbury, there is no diffiulty in terminating such a union if from any cause it has not been found to work well; but if all the machinery of an Order in Council has been set in motion, and the two parishes have been welded together by legal fetters, it might well seem simpler to acquiesce in a union, even if it had not fulfilled all the anticipations that had been formed respecting it, rather than go through the troublesome legal steps neccessary for its dissolution.

There is one other Statute relating to the union of benefices to which I ought to allude, because it contains a principle which is not to be found in the Statutes to which I have already referred. I mean the Act for the Union of Benefices in the Metropolis. By this Act power is given to sell a church and site, where a commission has reported that such church is no longer needed for the parish in which it is situated, and to apply the funds thus raised, and the endowment of such benefice, towards the erection of another church and the formation and endowment of another parish in some other part of the metropolis where it is more needed. So many consents are needed, and the rights of the parishioners are so carefully guarded, that the Act in question has had a very limited operation. But the principle of the Act has been very vehemently attacked. It has been roundly asserted that it is little short of sacrilege to pull down a building which has been erected for the service of God, and to use the site of such church for secular purposes. The question is a very difficult one. One cannot help sympathizing with the objection felt to secularizing Church property, and one cannot help wishing that funds could be found for meeting the spiritual needs of this great city in some other way. But when we contemplate the enormous daily growth of our metropolis, when we remember how very inadequate even the Bishop of London's Fund is to provide for this growth, I cannot bring myself to believe that it is in no case legitimate

to utilize endowments of a parish no longer needing them, and even the value of the site of a church no longer necessary, for the purpose of grappling with the ever present difficulty of providing for the growing spiritual needs of the metropolis.

There are some other ways in which the present distress might be relieved, but time will only permit me to make the slightest allusion to them.

The question of a sustentation fund has been already dealt with in the preceding paper, and I will add nothing to what has been said, except to express my opinion, that when a sum exceeding £1,000,000 a year has been subscribed for the last fifty years for the building and restoration of churches, it ought not to be impossible for some representative Church body, when formed, to raise a sufficient sum annually to augment all benefices to a minimum income of £300. It is difficult to calculate exactly what sum would be required for this purpose, but probably an income of £200,000 would enable such a body to do all that would be needed in the direction of levelling up the smaller livings.

Again, I feel sure that more might be done locally towards improving the stipends of the clergy. In most parishes there are one or two well-to-do residents who could guarantee something in augmentation of their incumbent's income. I know that, in many cases, these persons have suffered from the agricultural distress equally with the clergy. But they are, as a rule, quite ready to subscribe liberally towards the restoration or beautifying of their parish church; but are apt to ignore the financial anxieties of their parish priest. "These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone."

Another suggestion that is sometimes made is, that the whole revenues of the Church should be put into "hotch-pot," and be divided equally among all the benefices. Even if we ignore the fact that such a division would probably fail to raise the income of any living to a sufficient standard I cannot think that such an arrangement would be for the benefit of the Church at large. In every profession there must be prizes, if we wish to attract into its ranks the best of our sons, and while fully admitting that our clergy in the present day take Orders in no self-seeking spirit, it would be contrary to all experience of human nature if a dead level in the value of preferment in the Church did not tend to produce a dead level in the class of men seeking ordination.

Another remedy which the law permits is, that the income of one benefice should be utilized for the augmentation of the smaller income of another, where both benefices happen to be in the same patronage. It is a power which has, I think, been little used, partly because there are very few livings in England which are so well-endowed as to be able to yield any of their surplus endowment for the benefit of their poorer neighbours, and partly because serious discontent is usually caused if tithes are taken from one parish for the support of another. I have, however, seen advantage taken of the Act with good effect, in the case of a city living with an unnecessarily large endowment. But it is a power which requires being used with discretion. I was myself a party to its being used with grievous injustice. It happened in this wise. In the days of agricultural prosperity, there was a parish in the Midland Counties with a very small population, and with a large glebe producing a rent of over £1,000 a year, while, hard by, there was a country town

with a population of some thousands, and an income of less than £150. This, at any rate, seemed a case in which the provisions of the Act might be put in force without unfairness, and, accordingly, a scheme was carried through charging the revenues of the country parish with an annuity of £350 in favour of the ill-endowed country town. But the agricultural depression supervened; the rent of the glebe fell from £1,000 to £320, and in the present year the incumbent of the country parish would have paid over more than the *whole* of his income for the benefit of another parish, if the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty had not acted with great consideration, and waived their claim to a sum of £80, being an instalment of principal and interest on two mortgages, while the incumbent of the town living, acting with a like consideration, gave back £40 from the sum payable to him. This grievous wrong can only be remedied on a vacancy occurring in the town living, as no fresh scheme can be passed which would affect the rights of the existing incumbent. These, then, are some of the remedies which have been suggested for the present distress. With the exception of a sustentation fund, and the more frequent holding of benefices in plurality, they do not appear to me to be of a very practical nature. The latter remedy too, with which I have specially attempted to deal, should be applied with care; but where two parishes are conveniently situated in respect to each other, where their respective population is so small as to offer little attraction to a zealous, active-minded man to accept the charge, or the income so inadequate as to render it impossible for a poor man to undertake it, I believe that it may be applied, not only without detriment to the parishes in question, but for their spiritual welfare, and for the benefit of the Church at large.

The Worshipful T. C. BLOFELD, Chancellor of the Diocese of Norwich, and Recorder of Ipswich.

THE subject allotted me is a difficult one, for I can only deal with the remedies which are not within the scope of the two papers just read.

I shall take it for granted that the distress of the beneficed clergy from the depreciation of tithe and glebe is very great. Nowhere is it more severely felt than in this diocese, in which a few years ago there were 416 livings with an average net income of only £125 a year, a sum that has, I fear, since suffered considerable further diminution. The *res angusta domi*, with all its cares and anxieties, must often hinder the incumbent in his spiritual work, and take the heart out of him; and if he were importunate in his complaints, I should not be surprised; but he is not. On the contrary, I say that the clergy as a body have borne their financial distress with a quiet dignity and an uncomplaining fortitude which are above all praise.

I shall also take it for granted that it is the absolute duty of Churchmen to maintain their clergy. Our ancestors, by the endowments they gave, have to a large extent relieved us from this burden. Their endowments might still suffice for a celibate clergy, but the country requires on the whole a married clergy; they might still suffice for an

unlearned clergy, but the country requires an educated clergy. As our President told us not long ago, "a poor clergy is usually an ill-educated clergy." The one great remedy for this distress I believe to be what the Dean of Norwich has dealt with, viz., a National Church Sustentation Fund; and probably the next remedy in importance is that dealt with by Mr. Thesiger, viz., the Union of Small Benefices.

What, then, are the other remedies which are left for me to deal with? I fear they must be but slight and inadequate; still they may be of some good I would class them under the three heads of smaller local contributions, re-adjustment, and relief from burdens; and, as I have been requested to more particularly deal with the latter question, in connection with the subject of rates, I must be somewhat brief in my reference to the two former. I may add that, although the distress amongst the clergy is mainly attributable to the extremely low price of corn, I do not propose in this paper to discuss any scheme for increasing the value of our corn crops.

(1) First, then, as to smaller local contributions. I should like to see the practice of Easter offerings revived. The clergy, to their credit, are generally unwilling to go begging on their own account, but I do not think they need scruple now to ask for Easter offerings; and the money obtained, if not wanted in aid of the endowment of the parish, or of a curates' fund, might well be given to the proposed National Church Sustentation Fund, or to a diocesan fund if there be one. In the larger parishes I am confident a considerable sum could be raised in this way. I know, for instance, that in a parish in this diocese, with a population of 2,500, a little country town, where the system was introduced a few years ago, the contributions rose from £113 in the first year to £160 in the fourth, and I have no doubt they have still gone on increasing In a parish with a population of five hundred, no more than five shillings per house at Easter would bring in £25 a year, and even smaller sums than that would often be of great assistance to the distressed incumbent. The chief difficulty would be in the small country parishes where the population is made up of landlord, tenant farmers, and labourers. In this corn growing county we know too well that the landowner, *quâ* his income from the land, is practically ruined: indeed, the Norfolk Chamber of Agriculture has reported that the landowners in this county alone have lost in the last few years no less than thirty millions sterling; the tenant farmer, however low his rent, can scarce keep his head above water; and the labourer cannot be expected to spare more than the merest trifle from his scanty wages. I fear Easter offerings would be very little in the small country parishes, which would consequently have to look for help to the central or diocesan fund.

What I have said of Easter offerings is equally true of regular offertories, which should, I think, relieve the clergyman from all the small expenses connected with the church which he is now so often called on to bear unaided.

(2) Second, as to re-adjustment. The income of a benefice is not the property of the Church of England, but of the incumbent and his successors for the benefit of the particular parish, and it has often been objected that you have no right to take property from one parish for the purpose of giving it to another. I feel the force of this objection,

and I further admit that the fact of an endowment being parochial may tend to its security, inasmuch as it is easier to rob one great corporation than to rob fourteen thousand small ones. But the principle of taking surplus ecclesiastical revenues to augment poor livings has been established for the last sixty years by the Acts constituting the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and has worked well; and I do not believe that under the circumstances of the present time the clergy as a body would object to a general measure for diverting the surplus revenues of wealthy livings on the next vacancy to augment the very poor ones. Some patrons might no doubt object; and, unfortunately, experience teaches us, particularly in the Diocese of Durham, that a wealthy parish might rise in open and violent revolt against a scheme for the transfer of a part of its tithes to another parish; and, in the face of opposition of this kind, I believe that a general measure for the transfer of the surplus revenues of wealthy livings would be impracticable. The law, however, does at present provide for this being done in a limited class of cases, for a patron may so apportion the income of two or more livings in his own gift;* and, where no great opposition is likely to be aroused, I see no reason why patrons should not still avail themselves of this provision of the law. If, however, a general measure of compulsory re-adjustment of the income of livings is impracticable on account of the opposition it would meet with, I do not think anything like the same opposition would be made to a general measure for levying a moderate tax, on the next vacancy, upon the excess in value of wealthy livings beyond a specified amount, and such tax might well be paid into the common fund of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The relief afforded in this way would no doubt be much less than if the surplus revenues were transferred, but it is better to have half a loaf than no bread, and I believe such a measure as I suggest might become law.

There is another point connected with redistribution which I should like to bring before you for a moment. By the Lord Chancellor's Augmentation Act,† passed in 1863, the Lord Chancellor is empowered to sell the advowsons of 327 livings in his gift, and with the price to augment the value of such livings, or of other livings in his gift. Why should not this power be extended to Deans and Chapters, and Colleges, who often have small livings which they scarcely know what to do with?

(3) Thirdly, relief from burdens. The complaint is often made that the beneficed clergy are the only people who are rated on practically the whole of their professional income, and I, who have from time to time to audit the accounts of sequestered livings, know only too well how cruelly the rates cut into the available income.

Our present law of rating is based upon the Act 43 Eliz., c. 2, and it is under that Act that the incumbent is now rated as the occupier of his tithe and glebe. For centuries before the time of Elizabeth, however, he, amongst others, was required to contribute to the relief of the poor. Contribution nevertheless was not compulsory, for the churchwardens were to gently entreat people towards the relief of the poor, and if they

---

* 3 and 4 Vic., c. 113; 17 and 18 Vic., c. 84.
† 26 and 27 Vic., c. 120.

were obstinate and would not give, they were to be had up before the bishop, and he was to take order for their reformation; which, with all respect to the Episcopal bench, would not be a very effective way of enforcing anything like a rate. No doubt, therefore, contribution was systematically evaded, till at last, in 1603, by the Act of Elizabeth which I have mentioned, overseers were appointed whose duty it was to raise compulsory rates for the relief of the poor, and this was to be done by taxation (1) "of every inhabitant, parson, vicar, and other"; and (2) "of every occupier of lands, houses, tithes impropriate and propriations of tithe, coal mines, and saleable underwoods, in the parish." Now it made a great difference whether the parson was to be rated on his tithe under the first of these clauses, or under the second, because if he were rated under the first, it would only be as an inhabitant, according to his ability, *ad statum et facultates*, after deducting all necessary outgoings; whereas, if he were rated under the second, it would be as an occupier of the tithe, and according to its yearly value. The special mention of "parson and vicar" in the first clause is singular, and it has been suggested that the object of it was to show that the Church was not to be exempt from rating altogether, notwithstanding the provision of Magna Charta, "*quod ecclesia sit libera.*" Be that as it may, you will observe that the tithes mentioned in the second clause were "tithes impropriate and propriations of tithes;" that is, tithes severed from the living, and in the hands of ecclesiastical corporations or lay impropriators; and these, of course, the parson as such could not hold. It follows, I think, that the Statute meant to rate him as an inhabitant under the first clause, and not as an occupier under the second. In accordance with this reading of the Statute, it was laid down by a resolution of the judges in 1633 that the incumbent was to be rated according to the reasonable value of his living, "having consideration to the just deductions." However, rating parsons and other inhabitants according to their ability was, no doubt, found a difficult task; and by the time of Queen Anne it seems clear that the parson was, in fact, rated as an occupier of his tithe,* and there is an express decision in the fourth year of George I. that he should be so rated, and this has now been confirmed twice by Statute.† Still, however, he was not held to be ratable at the full annual value of his tithe, and there is no doubt that a proviso was inserted in the first section of the Parochial Assessment Act of William IV. to prevent his being rated on it at its full annual value, while other real property was rated at less; but unfortunately this proviso was so worded as not to give effect to its intention, and it is practically inoperative. By the decisions of the courts he was not allowed any deduction for his own personal services, but he was allowed to deduct for the stipend of a curate necessarily employed. Even this relief is now denied him by a recent case,‡ which was decided in accordance with a principle laid down by the House of Lords in a case relating to the rating of docks, that principle being that in rating it is not necessary that the occupation should be beneficial to the particular occupier, provided "the thing

---

* Castle on "Rating," third edition, p. 440.

† 3 and 4 Vic., c 89, and the 69th Sec. of the "Tithe Commutation Act," 6 and 7 Will. IV., c 69.

‡ R. *v.* Sherford, L.R., 2. Q.B., 503.

occupied" has an annual value over and above the deductions allowed under the Parochial Assessment Act as necessary to maintain the property at its annual value; and those deductions, such for instance as repairs and insurance, I need scarcely say are almost without exception inapplicable to tithes.

It seems to me that here the clergy have a real grievance. They cannot get the tithe at all without certain necessary labour and outgoings, any more than the farmer can get his crops without working the land, and paying the costs of cultivation. It is true in a sense that the clergyman's labour and expenses are not necessary to produce the tithe, while the farmer's labour and expenses are necessary to produce the crops which constitute the value of his land. The farmer is entitled to large deductions on these heads—the clergyman to scarce any. In equity, however, I contend the clergyman should be entitled to deductions for the necessary labour and outgoings, which are a condition of his enjoying his tithe at all. We forbid him by law to eke out his income by secular pursuits, and we compel him by law to the performance of certain duties, as a condition precedent to his right to the tithe; and if he cannot deduct for his own labour in the performance of these duties, and for the necessary expenses incident to them, he is not rated equally with the lay impropriator, who holds the tithe with no such duties or expenses attached to them; and yet equality is said to be the basis of rating. This grievance, however, cannot be remedied without legislation, and it is often said it is so hard to get Church legislation through the House of Commons. Experience shows that it has been so, but I believe it has been in a great measure because Churchmen have not been sufficiently unanimous in what they asked Parliament for. I believe if we establish a real grievance, and are united in asking a reasonable remedy, legislation will follow, though it may infringe some principle laid down in a dock case. The British constitution is made up of anomalies, and we have never been tied and bound to the rigid application of a principle when it works manifest injustice. I would suggest that in rating his tithe the incumbent should be allowed to deduct for all necessary expenses, and for his own services at as low a rate as you like, say at the lowest rate at which a bishop could fix the stipend of a curate in the case of a non-resident incumbent.

The deductions which are allowed as the law now stands are (besides for repair of chancel, if any) for Schedule B income tax, poor rates, ecclesiastical dues, losses, costs of collection, and law expenses; and these are not always allowed as they should be by Assessment Committees; and where that is the case no better course can be adopted than to invoke the assistance of the Tithe Owners' Union.

There is one other subject I should like to say a word upon. The rates, as we all know, are applied for purposes in which all Her Majesty's subjects are interested—such as relief of the poor, education, police, lunatics, county and parish purposes, and the working of numerous Acts of Parliament; and yet they are levied on real property alone, including tithes. Whatever may have been the case once, real property now constitutes but a miserable fraction of the wealth of the country, and the glaring injustice of levying rates upon that fraction

alone must soon be dealt with. There is no doubt that personal property was ratable under the Act of Elizabeth, but it slipped its neck out of the noose, and is now exempt by Act of Parliament. It must be made to bear a share—I do not say its fair share, for I do not expect to live to see that—but it must be made to bear some share of what now falls exclusively on realty, and I would beg all Churchmen to support, with all their influence, any measure with this object, remembering that in doing so they are helping to relieve their own clergy from an exceptional hardship.

In conclusion, let me say that the subject of the rating of tithe is of necessity dry and technical. I have endeavoured, as well as I could, to divest what I have written of technicality, but I fear I have not relieved it from the dryness; and I beg you kindly to attribute the wearisomeness of my paper, in some degree, to the nature of the subject, as well as to the defects of the writer.

ADDRESS.

R. T. GURDON, Esq., Letton Hall, Thetford.

WHEN I was asked by the powers that be to say a few words upon this occasion, I very willingly consented; not that I imagined I had anything very original or very startling to say—not that I imagined I had any new remedies to propound—but because I was glad to have the opportunity of expressing my sympathy with my clerical neighbours in their misfortunes; as I would, I hope, with any other class that is suffering from agricultural depression; and because I wished to assure them that I should only be too glad to help if I could, in the smallest degree, in any remedies that might tend to improve their position. Their position is, indeed, gloomy, and the outlook is gloomy too. Even a fresh apportionment of tithe would not help the clergy at all, and, low as is tithe now, it must for many years remain very low; and you can hardly expect the tithe-payer to regret that, especially when you know that on many occupations, even in many parishes, the sum which the landlord pays in tithe is considerably more than he puts into his own pocket. That can hardly be what was contemplated at the time of the Tithe Commutation Act.

Well, we have now a Ministry and a Parliament which will be likely to sympathize with our misfortunes. Sympathy does not cost much; but we ought to expect a little more than sympathy, and we hope for something a little more substantial. We have the right that our demands, made reasonably and in good faith, shall be fairly considered, and in a friendly spirit. I hope, however, that these demands will be put forward by laity and clergy, and that the laity and clergy will be of one mind in the matter. We have, however, to consider what we can do for ourselves. It is rather too much the temper of the age to fall back on the State in all cases. They have been accustomed to do that in Ireland for a long time, but in this country—at all events in the days of our prosperity—we have trusted mainly to our own exertions. In adversity, however, everyone is ready to catch at any straw. Can the State do much for us? I do not think it can do much, but, as Chancellor Blofeld has pointed out, it can do something. It may relieve the clergy of the burden of some of the heavy rates and taxes they now have to pay. The clergy, no more than anyone else, wish to be relieved of their share of the burden, but they wish to pay their fair share and no more. It can, for instance, be hardly fair for a poor country parson, who only keeps a small pony-carriage, to be called upon to pay £10 a year for his highway rate. That is what is happening now.

Our rates are not going down, but up! The County Councils are proving themselves to be a very expensive luxury. Parish Councils are proving equally expensive.

Then, in the case of schools. For years past the clergy have taken so much of the management, so much of the expense, of our rural schools on themselves (for which they have never been sufficiently thanked), that some people have begun to think that keeping up the schools is the peculiar duty of the clergy. Thus the clergy have been called upon to pay more than their fair share of the cost of the schools. To do something to relieve that manifest injustice is the duty of the State, and I hope that that will be done.

Then, what can we do ourselves? If we were all as comfortable as we wish to be, and ought to be, there would be no difficulty at all. We would soon raise that magnificent sustentation fund of which the Dean has spoken. But can we do it? Are we likely to do it? I think we can. When we look at what the Nonconformists, the Roman Catholics, and the Free Kirk in Scotland have done, we ought to be ashamed. We have raised in the last few years large sums of money to build new churches, and to repair and restore the old ones all over the kingdom. Surely we can raise a little sum for an important matter like this. The worst of it is that such a fund would be most difficult to raise in the places where it is most needed. In a poor diocese like this, for instance, where the money would be wanted more than in any other, it will be difficult to raise any considerable sum. Therefore, it would be rather a necessity that such a fund should be a national fund. Let us try and see if we cannot possibly carry it out.

The only other thing we can do is what Mr. Thesiger has said—to combine some of the smaller benefices. If they were all as rich as they ought to be, we should, of course, have an excellent clergyman in every parish. There are many parishes of small acreage, population, and income, which do not need a clergyman for themselves only, and it would be to the advantage of all to have these amalgamated. I scarcely think that the parishioners would object. If a parish was not large enough for the energy and activity of a good clergyman, let him have two to keep him occupied. There are many men who are now almost lost in little bits of parishes, who would only be too glad to find a larger field of labour. I think we might make a beginning in Norwich itself. I hope some speaker with more ability or inventive power than myself will be able to strike upon something which will bring prosperity back to the country clergymen, or, at all events, enable them to live in the comfort and happiness which they are entitled to look for, and which we all wish them to have.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. GEORGE N. HERBERT, Vicar of S. John de Sepulchre, Norwich.

IT seems to me that in order to obtain a practical view of the present financial position of the parochial clergy, we should do well for the time being to ignore the fact that we are dealing with a religious organization, and to look at it as a business man would at some large organization for the officers of which he had to provide adequate salaries. I say this because, when we deal with a religious institution, even in its more mundane aspect, the religious sentiment is apt to obtrude itself unduly, and prevent us from arriving at a common sense and true conclusion. Placing ourselves, therefore, in the position which a business man would take, it seems to me that the first thing such a man would ask is, "What is the magnitude of the evil which you desire to deal with. Is this financial pressure local in certain districts, or is it widespread. What classes does it affect amongst the clergy?" It is very clear what the answer to such a question must necessarily be. The distress amongst the clergy is appalling; it is widespread. In greater or lesser degree it affects nearly

every class. In fact it has assumed the magnitude of a national disaster, crippling the clergy in every way, and very much damaging, and in some cases even destroying, altogether their power of work. I think I can hear the comment of a shrewd, statesmanlike man of business. (1) He would say, "There must be no tinkering in this case, your sustentation funds may do very well as palliatives and temporary expedients, but at best they have very much the character of eleemosynary doles, which necessarily damage the self-respect of the recipient. We don't want that; we wish our clergy to remain a self-respecting body, a body of gentlemen, a body of scholars; and to maintain that character they must feel that their income is not paid to them as an alms, but because it is recognized that the labourer is worthy of his hire. This question must be dealt with by statesmen of the highest order, and as no statesman will deal with a subject of such magnitude until information has been collected and considered by experts, your first step should be to obtain from the present favourable Government a Royal Commission to investigate the matter thoroughly, in the fashion that the original Ecclesiastical Commission did more than half-a-century ago." Such, I take it, would be the first recommendation of our typical business man. (2) I feel quite sure what his second question would be. He would at once say, "What are your present available resources, and are you making the best use of them?" To this question I fear only one answer can be given. Take up the "Norwich Diocesan Calendar," look at the page which shows the rural deanery of Norwich, and see there the large populations and beggarly stipends of the local clergy here; look at almost any other page of the calendar, and see the small populations and comparatively large salaries, and what can be said from a business point of view? Simply nothing, as it seems to me. You may defend the present system from a historic, from a sentimental point of view, but from a practical common-sense point of view it is utterly indefensible. Your man of business will say, without a moment's hesitation, "You must utilize your present resources better before you can expect us to come to your assistance in any large scheme." Would he be wrong? I trow not. (3) Then I think there is a third point on which a man of business would insist somewhat strongly. He would say, "Supposing, for example's sake, some of us have helped to raise the stipend of some small living to a sum at which a man can live, and the living falls vacant. Without the slightest consideration for the views of those who have augmented the living, or for the unfortunate parishioners, some man is thrust into the cure simply and solely because of his political services, owing to some personal influence brought to bear on the patron. We should not like the money we have given to be so used." If, therefore, you expect this question to be dealt with effectually, one thing is certain, the people interested will have to be allowed more control, either in the form of nomination or veto, in the choice of the clergy. And now, having ventured to sketch out what I believe would be the views of a typical man of business, may I be allowed to submit, very briefly, the outlines of a scheme of financial reform which has been very kindly received by those to whom I have submitted it. Suppose the whole of the financial side of the Church were *tabula rasa*, and we had to begin *de novo*, how should we set about it in a method best adapted to these days? (1) Can we not obtain a clue to the answer from the present position of the education question, as it appears to the Archbishops' Committee. Here we have a huge national system, which exists, not for the benefit of its administrators, but for the good of the people at large. The Archbishops' Committee suggests two things which are applicable to our present question. They suggest that all the teachers should be paid on a uniform scale from the Central Department. That is the point I wish to emphasize—proportionate payment from a *central* body. But they also propose that the appointment of the teachers should be in the hands of those best understanding local needs, that is, the managers of the various schools. And this proposal has apparently very much commended itself to the Church at large. Here, then, we have the matured judgment of the ablest experts suggesting that the best way to work financially a great national scheme for the moral welfare of the people is to relieve those who are working the scheme from all financial anxiety by securing the salary from a central fund, and at the same time allowing the local people to have the choice of these workers. What is applicable to a great scheme for intellectual education and advancement is, or ought to be, even more applicable to any organization for the spiritual advancement of the people. (2) Apply this principle. I would say boldly and unhesitatingly, place the control of the whole of the finances of the Church in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners at once. We should at once receive one great benefit; much would be saved in money, and more in worry, by the finances being managed by a body organized for that purpose. (3) Next, let a Royal Commission be appointed

after the fashion of the original Tithe Commission, who should investigate the case of every living, and recommend a redistribution of the revenues to be effected gradually as the livings fall vacant, or as incumbents voluntarily assist in the scheme of redistribution. (4) Arrange the livings into three classes according to population or responsibility—third class livings £250; second class livings £400; first class livings £600. (5) Let all assistant clergy also be paid from the central fund, receiving at ordination £100 a year, and rising by £10 a year until they reach £200 a year. Invite contributions towards the central fund. With proper central control of the finances, and a voice in the choice of the clergy, there can be no doubt that the loyal Church laity who have so freely given their millions to build and restore churches, to found a gigantic system of education, and to found foreign missions the wide world over, will also pour their millions into the coffers of the central organization. No doubt whatever! And now as to the question of the patronage. We have the rights of three classes of people to recognize and reconcile. The clergy—particularly those who have no friends at court, and are above cringing and toadying—the patrons and the people. The general principle of my proposal will be made clear if we suppose a living of the third class to be vacant. Those whose claims we will consider first shall be the clergy. The clergy eligible would be the unbeneficed clergy of the diocese. Not all; length of service must count, as is only just. Say there are in the diocese one hundred unbeneficed clergy, then the first fifteen in length of service shall be the eligible ones; the choice shall be restricted to these fifteen—the young men must wait their turn as in other professions. Next let us consider the rights of the people. I think a popular election after the Board of Guardians or municipal honours style altogether indefensible. Still the people have their rights. The difficulty, then, is to allow the exercise of these rights without putting the vacant benefice up to popular election. I do not think the difficulty insuperable. The people have their official representatives in the churchwardens. Let this right of selection rest in the churchwardens; it would add to the importance and dignity of the office. If the people knew that this right was placed by them in the hands of the wardens, they would be all the more careful in choosing just and proper men, as they would never know when a vacancy might occur. Let, then, the churchwardens act as the representatives of the parishioners, and give them the right of selecting three names out of the fifteen eligible men, and nominating these three to the patron, and give the patron the right of final selection. Coupled naturally with this scheme would be that of an adequate pension scheme, carrying with it, as a matter of course, that of compulsory retirement at a certain age of all classes of the clergy. And I rather incline to the idea that it would not be a disadvantage if all appointments were made, not for life, but for a period of ten years, renewable should all concerned desire it. Such a plan would have many obvious advantages, though doubtless it would also have its drawbacks. There are many collateral questions which arise, and many objections that will occur to you. I have not dealt with these, not because I have failed to realize them, but because the dread of the president's bell has been ever present with me. And in conclusion, I would very earnestly commend my scheme to your consideration, as at least the basis of a scheme of national Church reform.

The Right Hon. the EARL NELSON, Trafalgar, Wilts.

I FIRST, as a laymen of the Church of England, wish to thank you and your Committee of Selection for putting this important subject prominently before the Congress; for although some people will say that you are always calling on the laity for money, it is really, to all good Churchmen, a subject of rejoicing when a demand is put upon us. It is the voice of God. It is a proof that God is with us still. I remember the time when we first came to realize what the true living Church was, and one of the first things we were called upon to do was to restore our dilapidated churches. *Donec templa refeceris* was the motto of the Cambridge Camden Society, and by God's mercy moving the hearts of His people those temples have been restored and rebuilt. After that, when we were called upon to do something for education, everybody acknowledged the importance of the call, and the means from the Church laity were forthcoming. We are now called upon seriously to consider the financial position of our clergy. There is a demand upon us for efficient ministrations everywhere. The Church Patronage Bill of last session would have secured that to us in a large measure. But how can we benefit from all this unless we are prepared to provide a Sustentation Fund

for pensions to our clergy? It is patent also from the reduction of tithe and of the rent obtainable from glebe lands, that we are called upon to do something for our clergy; and you may depend upon it that our Church will have renewed life according as it is brought to these further acts of self-denial. Therefore, it is a good and a blessed thing that these wants are pressed home upon us. There is one thing I would like to say in reference to a sustentation fund. I have very little care whether it is called a general sustentation fund or a diocesan one, provided that we are very careful that the administration of it is diocesan. We have at present a small fund for impoverished clergy in the Diocese of Salisbury, and I will give you an instance to show how important it is that we should have local voices in the distribution of the fund. We inquired of those who applied to us as to what the Society for the Benefit of the Sons of the Clergy had given in certain cases. We found that they had given relief in three cases in our diocese, and when the names were mentioned before our Select Committee for dealing with applications, a smile came over our faces, for we knew so much about these applicants as to prevent our giving them grants of £50 or £20 which they had respectively received. But let me take another line. We have dealt with this fund for two years, and we are painfully aware that there are many worse cases than those which come before us, and that it is perfectly impossible to get them at present to put their cases before us. Therefore, in the administration of such a fund, you require local knowledge. We know of a case where the archdeacon has been staying—a place where he found the daughters of the family working as servants in the rectory. The clergyman made no application for assistance. All he said was: "I won't make any demand except this. Will you try and get rid of the £4 a year payment that I have to make to Queen Anne's Bounty?" As to grants, I think that as long as we have patronage, and the sale of patronage, it will be perfectly impossible for us to attempt to improve the income of the clergy by endowing the living, but we must do it by grants to the incumbents themselves. There are, however, two other things which throw a considerable burden on the clergy. One is that a system has grown up of allowing the clergy to build very large houses with large grants from Queen Anne's Bounty, either because they want to take pupils, or because they have some rich relative to live with them. They charge it upon the living; and I know two or three livings which have been ruined after the rich man has gone by the large sums the incumbents have to pay to Queen Anne's Bounty. One remedy for this is, that Queen Anne's Bounty should not give a grant for a building of more that £2,000 value. And another remedy would be that in the case of great mansions the bishop should have power to allow the incumbent to let the mansion, and live himself elsewhere. There is another thing which bears heavily upon the clergy, and many of the cases of distress that come before us are occasioned by the necessity of paying for the serious dilapidations that occur, especially in the case of glebe lands. There is an Act of Parliament of which I availed myself in the only living which I have the gift of. I refer to Lord Salisbury's Act for the sale of glebe lands. It was designed originally and principally for the purpose of enabling small holdings to be obtained by the parishioners where there is a demand for them; and the first thing to be done is to try and satisfy that demand, and then you may sell the land to anybody after a proper valuation, and with certain conditions and restrictions, and thus save the clergy from many heavy charges.

The Rev. THOS. ESPINELL ESPIN, D D., Chancellor of the Dioceses of Chester and Liverpool, Prolocutor of the Convocation of York, and Rector of Wolsingham.

THERE is one point which has been touched upon in that paper of Chancellor Blofeld, a paper which I must say seems to me one of the most useful, practical, and sensible papers which we have had on the whole subject. That point is the question of the re-adjustment of the incomes of benefices. Now I am beneficed in the diocese of Durham, and I heard the late Bishop Lightfoot, some eight years ago, deliver himself of a scheme of that nature applicable to livings in his own patronage. The Bishop of Durham has four or five rectories in his gift, and they are of the best in England, the incomes ranging from £1,500 to £2,000 a year, and none of them with a very large population. By the scheme of Bishop Lightfoot, it was proposed to take so much from the income of these livings and add it to the other and poorer livings of large population in his own patronage, under the powers of which Chancellor Blofeld has spoken.

He left that scheme all carefully elaborated at the time of his much lamented and untimely death. He did not live to carry the scheme into execution himself; but when Bishop Westcott succeeded him, it happened that one of these livings fell in. The Bishop had, I believe, some misgiving as to the scheme working well, but he felt it his duty to give it a trial; and so when the great rectory of Easington—a valuable living of £1,500 a year—fell in, he proposed to take £200 a year off it, and apply it to a poorer and more populous living. Well, he put in his rector subject to this arrangement; but as soon as the parishioners got to know of it, great opposition arose. They held an indignation meeting immediately; the tithe payers declared that they would not pay any of the tithe, and the holders of glebe lands said that they would not pay their rents. They said that the endowment was strictly parochial; that the money was left only for their parish, and that they would not allow it to be taken away from the parish. In consequence of the opposition, the scheme had to be abandoned by the Bishop. Now I believe that the parochial character of the endowments of the Church is the sheet-anchor of their safety, and I am certain that any attempts made to divert them, such as have been suggested to you, will necessarily fail, because the people belonging to the Church of S. Peter, let us say, which we will suppose is well-endowed, will not see any reason why their property, which was left for the people of their parish, should be taken away from them and given to the Church of S. Paul, which is badly endowed, or whose property had been taken away by the monks or the Tudors. The scheme would not, therefore, be allowed to work; but there is one point which I think is practicable. I think that where a parish has become very rich indeed by the discovery of minerals on the glebe, or by building extensions, and the increase of population—as in the neighbourhood of Liverpool—and the income has risen very rapidly, in such cases I think there might be justice in applying some of that increase to purposes other than those which are strictly parochial.

H. J. Torr, Esq., Woodlands, Bridgnorth.

With regard to the remarks just made by Chancellor Espin, I do not think we ought to be as hopeless as he is of being able to teach English parishioners that parochialism is not absolutely a good thing. We ought to set before our people that the interests of the diocese and of the Church are higher than the interests of the parish. We all admit the greatness and the gravity of the question now before us, but how are we going to get the money? That seems to me the thing to be settled to-day. I would suggest in the first place that we want a more definite preaching by our clergy of the duty of giving systematically a tenth of our income to religious purposes. We boast that the income of England is £1,000,000,000 a year. The proportion of that which comes to the people of the Church of England should be £660,000,000. We were proud of ourselves last year because we raised five-and-a-half millions for our Church purposes. We ought to raise twelve times that amount, and therefore instead of being proud, we ought to humble ourselves in the dust. Therefore I urge that you, the ministers of the Church, ought to teach the people their duty on this point of systematic giving, and that we laymen and laywomen should keep a systematic account of the gifts which we make for religious work and add them up at the end of the year, and not be content unless the amount comes to one-tenth of our income. But beyond that, we shall never get any widespread financial support from the masses of our people, unless we recognize more than we have done the well-known English principle of taxation and representation going together—or, as I would rather put it, taxation and responsibility—by giving the people a responsible interest in the Church. That is the lesson which the Salvation Army has learned, and by which it raises from the poorest classes in England £800,000 a year, and we can only raise from the rich seven times that amount. It is because they make the humblest of the people responsible for the success of the Army. Our mistake in the past is that we have hitherto relied too much on the rich. They have given us their hundreds and thousands, and we have given them the worst form of return—unchecked private patronage. We want you to come down to the poorer classes and get their shillings; and if you go about it properly you will never again have a Welsh Disestablishment Bill passed in the House of Commons by a majority of forty. The Church fights now one-handed because she does not accept the aid of her laity. Nor need there be any fear, provided the organization is diocesan and not parochial, that by so doing the valued spiritual independence of the clergy need be impaired. That the introduction of the lay elements into the

government of the Church does not lessen spiritual efficiency is proved by our sister churches. In the English Church, the number of communicants in the year are only three times the number of baptisms. In the Scottish Church the number of communicants is five times the number of baptisms; and in the American Church the number of communicants is ten times the number of baptisms. But in the English Church there is no lay representation; in the Scottish Church there is comparatively little; while in the American Church the representation of the laity is complete throughout the whole Church system.

The Rev. EDWIN R. WARD, Chaplain of the Northern Hospital, Winchmore Hill, London.

IT is with much pleasure that I, having been Rector of S. Lawrence's, Norwich, for six years, find myself again in this grand hall to advocate the cause of the poorer clergy. In Turkey, when any case comes before a judge, the question is immediately asked—Where is the woman? I suppose they think that a woman must be at the bottom of all mischief. Well, here I cannot help asking—Where are the laity? With few exceptions, they are absent; for you ladies, I take it, are for the most part wives, or sisters, or daughters of the clergy. Now, no sustentation fund can be raised without the laity coming down with the cash. They have cash to spend on pictures and carriages, and on visits to the Riviera and Monte Carlo. The question is—have they the love for God and the Church, and their poorer brethren, to come down with their money to start the sustentation fund? We need also to put in force, especially in this city of Norwich, the other remedy which has been suggested—the Union of Benefices Act. I believe that in Norwich there are twenty livings under £100 a year. There are also six other churches within a radius of two hundred yards of my old Church of S. Lawrence. Talk about commercial competition! We have plenty of spiritual competition; and what we ought to do is to pull down some of the old churches that are falling into decay, sell the sites, and utilize the proceeds to increase the livings of the clergy, and so improve the condition of the people, for the clergy exist for the welfare of humanity. This system of removing old churches where they are no longer required has been put into operation in London, with great advantage to all concerned. I was sorry that Chancellor Espin spoke against the re-adjustment of incomes. If we do not re-adjust them, I am certain that we shall be disestablished and disendowed, and that we shall deserve such treatment. The Chancellor spoke as if it would be a dreadful thing to take from a very rich parish so as to give to a poor one. I wonder if he has read his Bible, where we are taught the grand principle of Christianity—"Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." It is for the richer Churchmen and the laity to bear the burden of the poorer parishes. It is true that some parishioners have the idea that their charities would be taken away, but the Act of Parliament for the Union of Benefices safeguarded that, and said that those parishes should have their own charities; and only the apathy of some of the bishops has prevented the Union of Benefices Act being put into force as it ought to have been.

The Rev. C. F. BLYTH, Rector of Wetheringsett; and Diocesan Inspector.

THERE are a great many points that a country parson feels very much tempted to dwell upon in connection with this large subject, but I will only mention one. A great deal has been said already, and not a bit too much, about the extreme depression and depreciation in the value of land in East Anglia. But I should like to point out that while landlords and tenants say, and truly say, that land is hardly worth having, there is a large section of the community very anxious to get hold of it. I refer to the agricultural labourers, who are applying largely for land for the purposes of allotments. As chairman of a Parish Council, I have tried to use what I consider to be the magnificent opportunity which the Local Government Act of 1894 has given to the country clergy for good ends, for the benefit of the parishioners. I have had to deal with many applications made to our Parish Council by the labourers of the parish for allotments. I have had many communications with landlords and tenants connected with the parish, and by almost all of them difficulties and hindrances are thrown in the way. We have on the one side landlords and tenants saying, and saying truly, that "the land is no good to us," but yet they won't part with it for this purpose. We have on the other side men asking for fields and saying—"We can make it pay, and we cannot

get it." That is the truth. The reason is not always that they apply for the best fields, or that it would be any disadvantage to the tenant to part with some part of his land because of the character of the rest. But the farmers do not encourage the men in their desire to obtain allotments, because they say—"If we do, when we want them to work for us they will be wanting to do their own work." Well, but is it good policy to lose their labour by refusing them land for allotments, and so drive the men from our villages—and it is often the best men and the young men who are going—into Yorkshire and the "shires," when by a judicious and wise apportionment of allotments to them in suitable quantities they may be kept at home upon the land. This is a practical matter in regard to the Church, for this reason, that landlords and tenants are for the most part Churchpeople. The agricultural labourers look upon them as such; and the difficulty of which I have spoken is making the separation between them and the labourers wider than it has been, and as the labourers are separated from their employers, so there is the tendency for them to separate themselves from the Church of their employers. Therefore I should like it go out to the landlords and the tenants from this Congress, that it is worth considering whether it would not be a wise and politic, as well as a right thing, for them to change their attitude in this matter towards the labourers.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

WITH regard to what has just fallen from Mr. Blyth, while I am sure he has spoken from his own knowledge, what he has said is not at all in accordance with my own experience. I can frankly and truly say that in going about in the diocese of Norwich I have always found the landlords most kind and generous, and anxious to meet the wishes of the agricultural labourers upon their estates. Of course there are landlords and landlords; but the most of them are really wishful to do all they can to meet the wishes of the labourers. Now with regard to the subject before us, I consider it to be one of the most important that can be brought under the notice of the Congress. I do not think I need emphasize at all the facts of the great and grinding poverty under which at the present time many of our clergy are suffering. I only mention it in order to endorse one sentence that fell from Chancellor Blofeld that the clergy of this diocese have borne their sufferings and privations with the most exemplary patience and dignity. There are a number of cases that have come before me secretly—necessarily of a confidential character—which have shown that amid their great hardships the clergy are not the men to cry out. They are suffering deeply in their circumstances, but they do not want their circumstances to be known. The question which arises in such a state of things is, what is to be done in order to provide a remedy. Some persons will say, "Why not utilize the existing revenues of the Church; why not cut and carve its old endowments and try to make the old umbrella cover twenty times the number of people it was intended to shelter?" But the question I should like to ask is, Where are the endowments that can bear to be curtailed? You may speak about "fat livings," but I do not know where they are to be found in this diocese. If you consider the instances given by previous speakers; if you consider the enormous deductions that have been made from the gross incomes of the clergy; if you remember the sad fact that many of them are burdened with large and expensive houses and grounds, which were provided when the livings were really good; then I think there are but very few livings in this diocese that would bear curtailment. None of our clergy are living in luxury, and there are very few who could live as they are living, or even in ordinary comfort, if they had not private means of their own. It has been proposed that the tithe should be taken from one parish and allocated to another. But then we know the fact that it would be utterly illegal, and a very difficult matter indeed, and one that would provoke the greatest amount of opposition, to take the tithes from one parish and allocate them to another. I will pass over some points, such as the question of the curtailing the incomes of capitular bodies, for I have never had the honour of being a member of a capitular body myself, with the bare remark that I should be really surprised to hear that there is much available from that source. And if the proposition is brought forward, as it often is—I am rather surprised it has not been mentioned to-day—of reducing the incomes of the bishops, I would remark that, before advocating this step, Churchmen must make up their minds quite clearly whether they wish the bishops of the present day to live in the same circumstances and the same style, and exercise the same hospitality as those of the past. Do they wish the bishops to live in the old historic palaces, or do they

not? If they do, then it is very certain that if any very considerable diminution is to be made in their incomes, you must only appoint as bishops men of very considerable private means; and you must consider whether that is always desirable. I know that there are different lines taken. There are those who take the conservative view of keeping up the old traditions, the ancient prestige of the bishops, and whatever dignity may accrue from external circumstances. On the other hand, there are the reforming party in the Church who maintain that, though at the risk of some loss, the Church must be adapted to the requirements of the times, and those things should be removed, as far as possible, which are thought a reproach against the Church, or afford a handle to her opponents. You must balance the matter for yourselves. With regard to myself, I would say this frankly, that if any well-devised scheme were brought forward for parting with the old palaces of the bishops—I should not like them indeed to go out of the possession of the Church, no, certainly not—but if there were a good scheme for utilizing such palaces for Church purposes, and good, substantial, modern houses provided for the bishops, and so any saving could be effected, I, personally, unless I alter my opinions, would certainly record my vote in favour of that scheme. Of course I do not wish to commit myself absolutely; I do not think you would ask me to do so. But according to my present feeling, if such a measure were brought forward, my present mind would be to personally support it with my vote. Various other suggestions have been made, many of them of considerable value, with regard to what can be done to remedy the present state of matters. As to the amalgamation of benefices, I myself have tried to do what I could in that direction, and have been the means in five and twenty or thirty instances of allowing two benefices to be held by dispensation. But you must all be aware that there is great difficulty about it. The consent of the patrons has first to be obtained, and when that is obtained there is often great opposition on the part of the parishioners. Whatever little scolding has fallen to my share since I came to Norwich has been simply and solely upon that ground, and on one occasion I got such a rating and a scolding from the good people of one parish as I have not had for many a long year. Passing by the admirable paper read by Chancellor Blofeld, I come to the scheme so well advocated by the Dean of Norwich. It is indeed the plan which I have advocated ever since I came into the diocese. I have urged that an endeavour should be made throughout the length and breadth of the land to bring it to pass that every Churchman and Churchwoman should contribute towards the support of the Christian ministry. But I must add that my proposition was not enthusiastically received. I told them—"My friends, you will have to come to this." Yet some of those who received my proposal with the greatest coldness were men who were most in need of assistance. I agree with everything the Dean has said, except that I think you ought to leave a certain scope for personal respect and love for the individual cleryman who ministers to the laity the Bread of Life. I do not think that you can dispense with that feeling. Many of the laity love their own clergyman; and if he is in need of support they will do all they can to support him in honour. But why should not that personal element come in with regard to the Easter offerings? If you have your parochial finance committee, and if everyone is asked to contribute to the support of the minister, why should that personal feeling of love towards him not come out in the Easter offertory, and the people be encouraged then to give liberally because they love their pastor? For my own part, were I a presbyter, and the choice were presented to me of being either quite independent or partially dependent upon my people, I should unhesitatingly prefer dependence on the love of my people. I endorse with all my heart the principle of a National Church Sustentation Fund, and as far as I can gather from this meeting, that proposition has met with almost universal concurrence. I would, however, remind the laity that this is entirely their matter. If the present clergy are starved, they will die off. Many of them have had a hard time. They will pass away. But for the future, it is necessary for the well-being of the Church and of the laity themselves that the clergy should be intelligent, educated men. I hope that the matter will be so promoted that the clergy of the future will receive that honourable support which the ministers of the Gospel are entitled to have, and which it is desirable for the well-being of the Church and of the laity that they should.

AGRICULTURAL HALL,

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 9TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY, DOCTRINE AND WORSHIP.

CONFIRMED AND ILLUSTRATED BY

(1) RECENT DISCOVERIES AND RESEARCH.

(2) THE CATACOMBS AND OTHER SOURCES.

PAPERS.

The Rev. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; and Prebendary of Wells.

OUT of a large subject I have chosen a single point to which I believe that attention needs to be directed. It is the position held by the Christian Prophets in the early Church. On no point in connexion with the earliest form of the Christian ministry has so much light been thrown in recent years. The Didachè, or Teaching of the Apostles, has shown us the Prophets in their full activity, and has enabled us to interpret the scattered notices of them which we find in the New Testament and elsewhere.

The Didachè was published eleven years ago, but much remains to be done for its criticism and elucidation. Its date and its locality are still quite uncertain. It is a composite document. The first half embodies an older manual, "The Two Ways," which may even be pre-Christian, and has been used likewise in the Epistle of Barnabas and elsewhere. Here we find it interspersed with citations from S. Matthew and S. Luke. The second half, which deals with Church ordinances, contains certain Eucharistic formulæ in which we find phrases that recall the writings of S. John. These formulæ must also have had an earlier and separate existence before they were incorporated into the Didachè.

For the locality, Egypt and Syria have been suggested; but the *data* are very small. The later history of the book points to Egypt. The anti-Judaic element, together with marks of familiarity with Jewish customs, suggests the neighbourhood of Palestine.

The first century, or the very beginning of the second, is the favourite date. But against this is the use of the phrase "the Gospel," in the sense of a written record, and the indebtedness to S. Matthew, S. Luke, and probably (though indirectly) S. John. It is scarcely to be expected that we should find traces of three of our Gospels in one short document at so early a date.

Probably the book represents a primitive stage of Church life, which had lingered on in some obscure locality, removed from the general current of development, and so preserving, perhaps to the middle of the second century, a condition of things which elsewhere had long passed away.

The chief figures in the Church in the locality thus pictured for us are not bishops and deacons, who are only mentioned towards the end of the book, but apostles and prophets. The apostles are missionaries, who travel continually, and do not settle down in any Christian community; their gift is for the world outside. But the gift of the prophets is for the Church itself. They may travel or settle, as they choose. Their function is that of speaking "in the Spirit," *i.e.*, under the influence of an immediate inspiration, declaring the will of God in the Christian assembly. Especially at the Eucharist the prophet's gift comes into play: he is free from restriction to the otherwise prescribed formulæ, and may "give thanks as he chooses." This seems to imply that if a prophet were present he would supersede all others in the celebration of the Eucharist.

The regard in which prophets are to be held demands, first, that their utterances and actions, however strange, are to be above criticism—to oppose them is the sin against the Holy Ghost. Secondly, that they are to be well provided for, and to receive first-fruits of every kind; "for they are your high priests." It is clear from this that the prophet has no superior in the community in which he resides.

Here, then, we see the Prophetic Order at its greatest height; but it is to be noted that we already have indications of the dangers which beset it as an institution.

(*a*) There are counterfeit prophets, who must be guarded against. Certain simple rules for discrimination are laid down.

(*b*) There are prophets, apparently genuine, whose actions challenge the gravest suspicion; but they may not be judged by men; they are to be left to the Divine judgment. In this, reference is probably made to immoral acts defended as typical of the union between Christ and His Church, and further justified as parallel to certain symbolic acts of the Old Testament prophets.

(*c*) Prophecy has been already abused by the covetousness of prophets, who have demanded food or money when speaking under the prophetic influence.

(*d*) Yet more important is it to observe the struggle which is beginning between prophecy, as an institution, and the local administrative order. "Appoint for yourselves," we read, "bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord." These are "not to be despised," as probably they often were by those who esteemed the prophetic enthusiasm as the supreme authority. Prophets are clearly not numerous; a local Church may be without any prophet at all. The advent of a prophet to such a Church would throw the local ministry at once into the shade. Yet after all, those functions of the prophet which were essential to the welfare of the Church could be sufficiently discharged by the local officers, the bishops and deacons: "for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers." Here we see the elements of a rivalry, insignificant at first, but destined to overthrow the prophetic institution. Time was too strong for the extemporaneous and enthusiastic, and was all on the side of the regular and permanent authority. The bishops and deacons, still waiting in the background, plainly have the future before them.

Besides these dangers to which prophecy as an institution was exposed, there was another and a very different one, of which we find

indications in the "Shepherd of Hermas." In turning from the Didachè to the Shepherd we pass from east to west. We are no longer among a scattered population, with its Churches here and there, visited by eminent strangers with prophetic gifts. We are in the great city of Rome, where the conditions of life are wholly different. We are, moreover, in the midst of heathen surroundings, at a time when the little of earnest religion that survives centres round magicians and diviners. Here prophecy has other perils.

The date of the Shepherd is much disputed. The book is permeated with the language of "The Two Ways," if not of the entire Didachè. If it is to be placed later than the middle of the second century, it must be purposely archaic in form, and intended to be regarded as an earlier production. In this case the picture of the true and false prophet may be in part a fancy portraiture ; we have little or nothing besides to make us suppose that there ever was an order of prophets in the Roman Church.

Hermas is shown a vision of the false prophet. His powers are not unreal, but diabolic ; his practices are those of heathen mantic prophecy. He gives answers privately to those who consult him ; he is dumb in the assembly of believers. The true prophet only speaks in the Christian congregation ; the false prophet prophesies in a corner for reward.

No doubt there was something of this mantic prophecy within the Christian Church. Simon Magus, and the legends that cluster round his name, are a proof of it. Moreover the accusation of magic, so often brought against the Christians, was perhaps not always unfounded. The very name of "prophet" must in any case have suggested it to the heathen mind.

This mantic prophecy was of course wholly different from Christian prophecy. But the confusion was inevitable ; and the writer of the Shepherd is at pains to emphasize the true distinction.

Two character sketches of the satirist Lucian throw a lurid light on this possible abuse of the prophetic position. One is entitled "Alexander, or the false Diviner ;" it shows us the practice of sooth-saying and oracle-mongering as it flourished in the Greek and Roman world of the second century. The other, "The Death of Peregrinus," is more directly important for the illustration of our subject. We see here the kind of impostor who then travelled and traded on the religious sentiment. Among other transformations Peregrinus adopts the *rôle* of Christian prophet. He is spoken of as interpreting the sacred books of the Christians, and as writing fresh ones for them. He even goes to prison as a confessor, and is well looked after there by the widows and other ministers of the Church. Presently he is detected and disgraced, and he ends as a Cynic philosopher, burning himself at the Olympic festival in order to gratify the passion of his life, the desire for notoriety. It is to be noted that Peregrinus is distinctly spoken of as a "prophet," and that, although previously unknown, he rises at once to a position of pre-eminence in the Christian community.

Thus far, then, we have seen the Order of Christian Prophets, as it is depicted for us in the Didachè, a document which I must again remind you represents an imperfect type of Christian society, confined perhaps within a narrow local range. We have seen, too, the perils of various

kinds to which that order was by its very nature exposed; and we have seen side by side with it the administrative order, sometimes temporarily overshadowed by it, but destined to abide as the permanent ministry of the Church when prophecy as an institution had passed away.

Let us now look back to the New Testament, and ask what is the position of the Christian Prophet there. The conception of a prophet, as it had gradually been worked out in the history of Israel, was that of a man who speaks from God, to warn, to console, sometimes to foretell. Such voices of God had long been silent when S. John the Baptist recalled the figure of the Prophet Elijah. Once more men listened to the Divine Voice speaking through a man's lips. "A prophet, and more than a prophet," had appeared. The work of Christ Himself is several times described as prophetic, and His hearers spoke of Him as "a great prophet."

The new Israel of God could not be thought of as less fully equipped for its divine mission than the old Israel had been. On the day of Pentecost the words of Joel were remembered: "I will pour out of my Spirit . . . and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." Agabus, Judas, Silas, and the four daughters of Philip, are specially named as prophets and prophetesses. Agabus foretold events; but as a rule the function of the prophets was to declare the Divine will, as at Antioch, when Barnabas and Saul were sent on their first mission, or again when prophecy pointed out Timothy to be the ordained companion of S. Paul. Besides this it was their part to make exhortation and to give thanks in the Christian assembly.

In S. Paul's earliest letter to a Greek Church he has to defend the position of prophecy: "Quench not the Spirit, despise not prophesyings." In Corinth he has to check the extravagance of some who exercised the gift in a tumultuous manner, and he lays down as a guiding principle that "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." In the Epistle to the Ephesians he declares that "the Church is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets"; that to "His holy apostles and prophets" the mystery of Christ is revealed; and that among the gifts of the ascended Lord to His Church, "some" are "apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers"—words which recall an earlier passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians: "God appointed in the Church first apostles, secondly prophets."

The Apocalypse, in its first and last chapters, is distinctly described as a "prophecy," and the seer in one passage is linked with "his brethren the prophets." "The saints and apostles and prophets" are called upon to rejoice over the fall of Babylon, which has shed "the blood of prophets and saints." In the letter to Thyatira, "Jezebel which calleth herself a prophetess," if not an individual woman claiming inspiration, at any rate represents an abuse of the gift of prophecy for immoral purposes.

I cannot but feel that there is some connection which has not yet been worked out between the Didachè and the Second Epistle of S. Peter. That Epistle gains a new significance when we read it in the light of what we now know of Christian prophecy and the perils which beset it. After a mention of "the prophetic word, to which ye do well in taking heed," a terrific denunciation follows of the "false teachers," who are said to correspond to the false prophets of the ancient Israel. Their

immorality and their opposition to constituted authority is emphasized both here and in the parallel section of S. Jude. They are compared to Balaam who prophesied for hire, and to Korah who resisted Moses and Aáron. The prophecy of Enoch is quoted against them. They are denounced as a disgrace to the Christian love-feasts. It may be that the title of prophet is purposely avoided in speaking of them. They have their visions and dreams, but they are "sensual (psychic), not having the Spirit." In contrast with such, true prophecy is again mentioned, and the faithful are charged to remember earlier utterances of "the holy prophets." That in some of these passages we cannot sharply distinguish between Old Testament and New Testament prophecy is perhaps due to an intentional vagueness on the part of the writer.

The New Testament, then, leaves us no room to doubt that in the primitive Church, next in importance to the Apostles stood the Christian prophets. Prophecy, like other *charismata*, was an endowment of the Church as a whole. This is clear from the scene at Pentecost (for we cannot entirely sever prophecy from the gift of tongues), and also from another significant occasion when prophecy followed the laying on of Apostolic hands. But, like other *charismata*, it manifested itself especially in certain individuals. No human choice, however, determined their selection; and this in itself differentiated them from the administrative officers of the Church. The prophetic gift was at once recognized wherever it appeared, and its possession raised the humblest to a position of eminence.

Besides the biblical names which we have mentioned, we hear of Ammia of Philadelphia and Quadratus of Athens as exercising the prophetic gift, and other prophets and prophetesses appear among the early sects. The strangely interesting revivalistic movement called the Phrygian heresy, and commonly known as Montanism, was a vast effort to resuscitate prophecy, and to magnify the enthusiastic authority against the administrative. This endeavour has had several parallels in later history; but again and again organization has been too strong for it, and prophecy as an institution has been found to be incapable of revival.

In its most spiritual element the gift of prophecy may be said never to have become extinct in the Christian Church. Age after age has seen the rise of great teachers, alike within and without the ranks of the regular ministry; men who were dominated by a sense of immediate mission from God, and filled with a conviction which imparted itself by contagion to their hearers. But prophecy as an institution is what we have been considering, and as such it was destined to pass away, leaving those of its functions which were vital to the Church's well-being to be discharged as a rule by the settled ministry, which rose to its full height only on its rival's fall.

In reviewing the causes of the disappearance of the prophetic order, we may give the first place to this necessary rivalry with the administrative authority. To the prophets themselves no administrative functions are ever assigned. This very exemption led to a contrast, and ultimately to a conflict, between them and the regular Church officers. It became intolerable, as time went on, that the ordinary officers should be liable to contradiction and opposition from irresponsible

enthusiasts coming and going as they chose. So long as administration was quite subordinate, and the prophets were true expounders of a Divine message, all would go well; but the expansion and general settlement of the Church gave a growing importance to the official class, and a dual control was inconsistent with the Church's unity. Moreover, as we have seen, the institution of prophecy contained the elements of its own dissolution. Even to the genuine prophet the fulfilment of his function brought serious peril. The loss of self-control involved in the ecstatic condition—and ecstacy was a common, though not universal, accompaniment of prophecy—has often been observed to have a weakening effect on morals. Already in the New Testament we have found indications that immorality was sheltering itself under a prophetic guise. Again, the prestige and emoluments attaching to the prophetic gift made it worth while for unworthy persons to simulate the possession of it. Nor was it easy to discriminate between the true inspiration and the sensual excitement which strove to counterfeit it. Once more, in the Greek and Roman world magic and mantic prophecy was everywhere in full play; and it was inevitable that Christian prophecy should come to be confused with practices which had this at least in common with it, that they claimed to be direct communications with the invisible world.

We need not seek further for the causes of its decay. It had served its turn in the first enthusiastic stage of the Christian Church. As the Church grew larger and stronger, stress was of necessity laid upon the permanent organization on which its corporate unity depended. Irregularity was destined to give way to regularity, and the ministry of enthusiasm yielded to the ministry of office.

It may perhaps be thought that the temporary institution of prophecy has but little to do with the problem of the Christian ministry as it presents itself to ourselves to-day. I cannot think so. The liberty allowed to the prophets in the celebration of the Eucharist is a sufficient reply to such a suggestion. The lesson which seems to be taught us by the study of the subject is this. The first century of the Church's history is a period of rapid change; we might almost say a period of experiment. We know too little to allow us to dogmatise about the first forms of its earliest institutions. Much remains obscure with the obscurity which invariably belongs to life and growth.

Unless we believe in the Catholic Church as the Living Body of Christ in the world, inseparable from Him and instinct with his Holy Spirit, growing with a real growth from infancy towards a perfect man, we shall find it hard, if not impossible, to justify our own position to-day. We cannot discover the developed ecclesiastical order of the days of Irenæus, of Origen, of Cyprian, within the covers of the New Testament. The elements of that order are undoubtedly there; but side by side with them are other elements, which for a brief period, in some localities at any rate, are counted of higher importance. History is the record of the unfolding of life. It shows us the man putting away the things of the child. It declares to us that development—the transformation rather than the renunciation of the past—is the very prerogative of life. Not by the promulgation to the Apostles of an unalterable constitution for the Christian Church, but rather as the esponse of a living organism to the necessities of its environment; not

in "the great forty days," nor in the first century, but by slow processes under the continuous guidance of the promised Holy Spirit; not everywhere at the same moment, but at various rates of progress in various localities, and not at all universally till the middle of the second century; not from without, but from within; not at once, but in time was the Church's Order revealed by the Divine will, where at first could be traced but the elements of that Order in the immaturity of the sacred beginnings of life.

The Rev. F. H. CHASE, D.D., Principal of the Clergy Training School, Cambridge; and Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of York.

WHAT have the discoveries and the research of the last five years contributed to our knowledge of the *worship* of the Early Christian Church? This is the question to which I hope that this paper may supply some kind of answer. It is true that we cannot point to anything of the first importance. The storehouse of the student has, during this period, received no sheaves so rich as the closing chapters of Clement's Epistle or the Didaché. Yet the gleaner and the winnower have their part to play. I desire to call attention to typical instances of their work, and to give an account first of what may be classed as a discovery, then of a piece of research.

(1) In the Gnostic work called *Pistis Sophia*, reference is twice made to two books of Jeû, "the angel of light," which, it is said, the Lord communicated to Enoch "when He spoke with him out of the tree of knowledge and out of the tree of life in the Paradise of Adam." A Coptic manuscript containing these two books of Jeû was brought to England last century by the traveller Bruce. Strange to say, the text of these books has been published only within the last three years, the editor being a German scholar, Dr. Schmidt, who has translated them and examined them with marvellous industry and care.* The books of Jeû he assigns to the early part of the third century, the closely related *Pistis Sophia* being a few decades later in date.† We are only concerned with the liturgical evidence which these books supply.

But you will say: What right have you to seek in the writings of heretics for information about the worship of the Church? I answer, that in the detritus of heretical rites there are often found fossils of Church custom—survivals of the Church life from which the heretics had drifted away. And you will observe that whatever evidence as to the life or worship of the Church we can gain from such writings reaches back to a date earlier than that of the writings themselves.

The question has sometimes been asked whether the Apostles were baptized by our Lord. These Gnostic books answer the question in the affirmative, and describe their baptism. It takes place within, apparently towards the close of, the twelve years during which, it is said, the Lord continued after His ascension to visit and instruct His disciples. In the *Pistis Sophia* the scene is a mountain of Galilee,

---

* Texte u. Untersuchungen, viii. Band, Heft 1, 2 (1892).

† Dr. Schmidt thinks that the fourth book (to which reference is made below) and, perhaps, the third, are earlier than the other parts of *Pistis Sophia*.

one of the details which connect this Gnostic literature with the recently discovered *Apocalypse of Peter*.

The Lord promises to reveal to His followers, male and female, "the great mysteries of the treasures of light." "But before all else," He is represented as saying, "I will reveal to you the three baptisms—of water, of fire, of the Holy Spirit. And I will vouchsafe to you the mystery of the removal of evil from you, and afterward the mystery of the spiritual unction." These two latter mysteries correspond respectively to exorcism and to the rite which we know to-day by the name Confirmation.

The disciples are then commanded to find a man or a woman of virgin purity, and to receive from the hands of such two pitchers of wine. They obey, and bring the pitchers to Christ. The sacramental rite, in which, it will appear, Baptism and the Eucharist are fused together, then begins. Jesus places (apparently on a table) a *θυσία*—the word is transliterated in the Coptic—placing one pitcher of wine on the right of it, the other on the left. At His command the disciples put on linen garments. Standing by the *θυσία* He spreads out a linen napkin (comp. *Acta Thomæ* 46, *ἁπλώσας σινδόνα ἐπ' αὐτὸ ἐπέθηκεν ἄρτον τῆς εἰλογίας*), and sets thereon a cup of wine and loaves according to the number of the disciples. He then, having sealed them with the seal of certain mystic words, offers to the Father a prayer for their forgiveness and purification, and asks for a sign of the acceptance of the prayer. The sign is given. The wine in the vessel on the right of the offering becomes water. The disciples then come before Jesus. He baptizes them. He gives them of the offering (*προσφορά*), and seals them. "Then were the disciples exceeding glad, for that their sins were blotted out and their iniquities covered."

The baptism of fire and the baptism of the Holy Ghost follow, the variations being unimportant for our present purpose.

Let me try to disentangle the points of interest. The merging together of the rites of Baptism and of the Eucharist is a parody of the custom implied in Justin's account of the worship of the Church (*Apol.* i. 65); *i.e.*, the immediate admission of those who had been baptized to participation in the Eucharist.

In regard to Baptism, we have here a witness to a Church custom of which the Didaché speaks, "Pour water *thrice* upon the head in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." But the three-fold baptism of the Church has been expanded into the three separate baptisms of the Gnostic with distinct names, recalling the Baptist's words: "I indeed baptize you with water . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Again, we have here repeated allusions to the two ancient names for baptism—*φωτισμός* and *σφραγίς*. The "linen garments" put on by the disciples recall the white raiment of the baptized. Moreover, amid the incrusting dross of Gnostic formulæ we discover the gold of ancient baptismal prayers: "Forgive their sins; blot out the misdeeds of which wittingly and unwittingly they have been guilty from their childhood until this day, and grant them to be counted worthy of the inheritance of the kingdom of light." In the *Pistis Sophia* a similar but more elaborate prayer is converted into a prayer of preparation for the Eucharist by the addition

of the words, "So that they may be worthy to partake of this offering, O holy Father."

Turning to the subject of the Eucharist, we notice that the terms *προσφορά* and *θυσία* are used. In the *Pistis Sophia* Jesus is represented as standing before an "altar" (*θυσιαστήριον*). In the passage which I read just now from the Book of Jeû, we seem to have a picture of the arrangement of the Holy Table. In the *Pistis Sophia* the arrangement is somewhat different, two cups of *water* having a place assigned them. There, too, we find what is perhaps the earliest application to the eucharistic cup of the incident recorded by S. John;* for, after a reference to the "living water," the Lord is represented as saying to the disciples: "For this cause I took a cup of wine and gave it to you . . . and for this cause also they thrust a spear into My side; there came out blood and water." Lastly, the change of wine into water described in the Book of Jeû should be compared with what Irenæus (i. 7, 1) tells us of a Gnostic teacher, Marcus, who pretended by a prolonged invocation to make the contents of the eucharistic cup "appear red and purple." It is deeply significant that the spiritual teaching of Justin and Irenæus as to the Eucharist gives place among these Gnostic heretics to the conception of a magical and material transformation.

(2) I turn now to the region of research. We have been long familiar with the question and the answer, "What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper? Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received." Professor Harnack some four years ago put forth a learned and elaborate paper in which this position is controverted.† The conclusion which he reaches is this. The Lord, on the night of the betrayal, instituted as His memorial a simple meal. The most constant element in a meal is bread. Drink is only the accompaniment of bread. Hence the cup is subordinate, and its contents may vary. The eucharistic elements, then, are the Bread and the Cup, but not necessarily a cup of wine. The history of the elements Professor Harnack traces thus. Till about the middle of the second century a cup of wine *or* a cup of water was used in the Eucharist. At that time two influences began to operate. On the one hand, greater stress was laid on the exact words of Scripture. The phrase of S. Luke (xxii. 18)—"this fruit of the vine"—shows that as a matter of fact the Lord consecrated a cup of *wine*. Hence, for a Scriptural reason, the Church insisted on the use of wine. On the other hand, the Gnostics condemned all use of wine as of the devil, and in the Eucharist administered either the Bread alone or the Bread and a Cup of *water*. Such asceticism the Church rightly held to be perilous, and thus for controversial reasons insisted on the use of wine, and (perhaps by way of compromise) emphasized the "mingled cup."

It is impossible in the time at my disposal to bring out the strength and, I must add, the weakness of the arguments by which Professor Harnack supports these novel conclusions. I restrict myself to two pieces of evidence on which he lays especial stress. *(a)* Professor

---

* The earliest *Church* writer, so far as I know, who so applies John xix. 34, is Gennadius (*P. L.* 58, 998) towards the end of the fifth century (Bp. Wordsworth, "The Holy Communion," p. 189).

† Texte u. Untersuchungen, vii. Band, 2 Heft (1891).

Harnack claims S. Paul as a witness. The Apostle (1 Cor. x. 4) calls the water of the rock, of which Israel drank, spiritual drink, a type of the eucharistic cup. That cup, then, must needs have been a cup of water. It is sufficient to reply that a type is symbolical of, not identical with, its antitype. Again, in Rom. xiv. 21, "S. Paul asserts absolutely," to quote Professor Harnack's words, "*it is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine.*" "It is," he adds, "a worthless evasion to assume that here the eucharistic wine is excepted. To judge so is to judge from a catholic, a modern, standpoint. . . . The Apostle points to the bread and the cup of water as sufficient." It is strange, we answer—passing over other points—that any careful and sympathetic student of S. Paul's Epistles should construe the Apostle's impassioned plea for charity as laying down a rigid and universal regulation.* I gladly refer to the discussion of the whole section of the Epistle in Dr. Sanday's and Mr. Headlam's Commentary, which we welcome as an epoch-making contribution to the study of S. Paul. *(b)* But the centre and core of Professor Harnack's paper is the discussion of the eucharistic elements in Justin. It will be remembered that in the text of Justin as we have it they are three times spoken of as bread, wine, and water (Apol. i.,65, 67). Professor Harnack argues that in each place the word *wine* is the interpolation of a later scribe, and that, therefore, if the true text of Justin is restored, the elements are described there as bread and a cup of water. It is, of course, impossible here and now either to state or to examine in detail Professor Harnack's arguments. My own conclusion, though it seems presumptuous to state it thus summarily, is that, unless some new discovery supplements the very meagre authority on which the printed text of Justin's "Apology" rests, and alters the balance of evidence, there is no adequate reason to doubt the soundness of the text at this point. But one consideration of great importance both generally and especially in regard to Justin is overlooked by Professor Harnack; I mean the symbolism of wine. Justin four times interprets Jacob's prophecy, "He washed his garments in wine," as referring to the blood of Christ, human, but not of human generation. To the mind, then, of Justin *τὸ αἷμα οἴνος ἀλληγορεῖται* (Clem. *Paedag.* i. 6), "blood is symbolized by wine." I find it hard to believe that Justin would have spoken of the eucharistic cup as consecrated "in memorial of His blood" (*Dial.* 297A; comp. Apol. i. 98A), if the cup had not been a cup of wine.

If Professor Harnack's view as to S. Paul's words and as to the text of Justin cannot be sustained, his theory loses its chief supports. Nor are positive arguments for the position that the practice of the Church is both primitive and in accordance with Christ's institution either few or insignificant, *e.g.*, the natural symbolism of wine above referred to; the historical fact that cups of wine were regularly used at the Paschal feast, a fact to which Professor Harnack, strangely enough, does not allude; the emphasis laid in the earliest times on the solemn presentation to God of the elements as fruits of the earth on which man had bestowed labour—hence the use of the terms *θυσία* (from Mal. i. 11, see *Did.* xiv.) and *προσφορά* (see *e.g.*, Justin *Dial.* 41; Iren. iv. 31 3).

* Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 18. "If meat make my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I make not my brother to stumble."

Though, however, we are unable to accept Professor Harnack's conclusions, his investigation—apart from its detailed instructiveness—is not without significance. The fact that so great a scholar can plausibly maintain that in the earliest age of the Church the eucharistic cup was frequently a cup of water, is, if I may use the phrase, a picturesque comment on the words of the Lambeth judgment—"The consecration and administration of a mixed cup is . . . a primitive, continuous, and all but universal practice in the Church." It is a practice, we may add, for which in the second century we have three clear witnesses—Justin Martyr, Abercius, and Irenæus, the last speaking both of catholic (*e.g.*, iv. 51; v. 2, 2) and of heretical usage (i. 7, 2), and on the confines of the second century Clement of Alexandria (*Paedag.* ii. 2). It is a practice which, just because of its essential triviality, is a speaking testimony to the account of the institution given in the Gospels. Whatever its symbolical meaning may be thought to be, it clearly has an historical and, so to speak, an apologetic value. For, to quote words of Dr. Edersheim,* "red wine alone was to be used at the Paschal supper, and always mixed with water." "Of this," he adds, "there cannot be the slightest doubt."

I referred just now to the epitaph of Abercius. Its discovery, it will be remembered, we owe to the unrivalled industry and sagacity of Professor Ramsay. As Bishop Lightfoot discussed it at the Carlisle Congress in 1884, it has a kind of prescriptive claim on our attention. I close this paper with a necessarily brief account of recent criticism in regard to it. An attempt has been made† to explain it as the purely pagan epitaph of a priest of Cybele, an attempt which certain lines in it successfully resist. Quite recently Professor Harnack has investigated it anew,‡ and has come to the conclusion that it is not the work of a catholic Christian, but an instance of *syncretism*—a mingle-mangle of Christian and pagan ideas. Thus, to go no further than the opening words, Abercius describes himself as ἐκλεκτῆς πόλεως ὁ πολίτης. A catholic Christian, Professor Harnack argues, would not have spoken thus, for many passages in early Christian literature show that such men regarded themselves as "strangers and pilgrims" in this world. Quite true. But I cannot but remember that S. Paul, who wrote to the Philippians that "our citizenship is in heaven," did not hesitate to speak of himself as "a citizen of no mean city," and in a most practical way to use his rights as a citizen of Rome. In fact, many of the difficulties which are pointed out are met by the remark of Bishop Lightfoot, that the epitaph "is no systematic exposition of the theologian, but the chance expression of a devout Christian soul," who, I would add, without being a poet, elected to describe his fortunes and his feelings in the trammels of verse. It may, I think, be questioned whether the wild *syncretism*, of which Professor Harnack thinks the epitaph an example, was not the outcome of a period to which the epitaph can hardly be referred, the period when, after the so-called

* "The Temple," p. 204. See Bishop Wordsworth, "The Holy Communion," Ap. I.

† By G. Ficker (Sitzungsber. d. K. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. 1 Feb. 1894). Dr. Zahn (Forschungen V, 1893) investigated it and recognized it as an early Christian monument.

‡ Texte u. Untersuchungen, xii Band, Heft 4 (1895).

conversion of the Empire, pagan temples were destroyed, and populations still essentially pagan were swept into the draw-net of the Church. We may expect, I believe, that in the end criticism will substantially confirm its earliest verdict, and establish the view held by Bishop Lightfoot that the epitaph of Abercius "is second to no early monument of Christianity in interest . . . full of matter illustrating the conditions and usages of the Church in the latter half of the second century."

I do not know that attention has been called to one of its closing lines. This Ulysses among Christian bishops, "who saw the cities of many men and knew their mind," prepares in his life-time an epitaph for his own tomb. At the end of it he makes the significant request—"Let every friend who observeth this, pray for me."

ADDRESS.

(1) Recent Discoveries and Research.

The Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, B.D., All Souls' College, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Southwell.

In the short time at my disposal this afternoon, I propose not to confine myself to a single document, but to suggest what, as far as I am able to judge, are the bearings of modern criticism on our English theory of the Church; for I presume the question before us is not what is the evidence for this or that ecclesiastical custom? We know that customs may change. But what grounds have we for believing in an ecclesiastical system as a part of Christianity; for believing that the Church should be an organized, united body, with its duly appointed ministers, and its duly appointed rules and discipline; for believing, in short, in what I may call an ecclesiastical system as opposed to a congregational system?

(1) Now, the first document I will consider is the Acts of the Apostles. This is, if you will examine it carefully, quite clearly an ecclesiastical document—not in a sense which would be offensive to any English Churchman, but it is, all the same, ecclesiastical. It throughout represents the Church as a practical unity subservient to the rule of the Apostles. It represents them as ultimately the source of spiritual gifts and the court of appeal in difficult cases. It lays stress on the unity of the Church, and on the efforts of the Apostles, and especially of S. Paul, to preserve this unity. Now, this ecclesiastical character of the Acts of the Apostles has been definitely recognized by modern critics, and has been made one amongst the grounds on which they have assigned it, not to a companion of S. Paul, writing in the first century, but to a writer, with an ecclesiastical purpose, in the second century, who constructed a fancy picture of the early Chuch. Now of course it is begging the question on their part to say, that because the document is ecclesiastical, therefore it is late; and there has been a great deal too much of such question begging in Church history. What I want now to point out to you is, that the authority for considering the Acts a genuine document of the first century has been very much strengthened in the last few years, and it has been strengthened, not by the work of Christian apologists, but by that of quite independent critics, who have approached it as an ordinary historical document, to be judged by the ordinary rules of historical evidence. The first is Professor Ramsay, of Aberdeen, whose name is well known to most here. He began by assuming that the opinion of the German critics was correct, and that the Acts was a second century document; but he had need to use it in studying the geography of Asia Minor, and

gradually it became apparent to him that he had before him, not a fancy picture of the second century, but a genuine historical document of the first. This opinion he first published in "The Church and the Roman Empire;" and he has now made it the basis of a work which will shortly appear on the latter half of the book itself, a work which I can strongly recommend to the notice of all those interested in Church history. Our other witness comes from Germany. Professor Blass, of Halle, is one of the most distinguished of German classical scholars. He has been induced by some cause, I do not know what, to turn his attention to the Acts of the Apostles. He has written what he terms an *Editio Philologica*, and he, also, has approached the book as an ordinary classical work. He equally maintains, and maintains in a very effective manner, the genuineness of the book, while for the critics, whom he calls somewhat sarcastically "theologians," and for their methods, he has some very severe words of criticism.

Now I do not wish for a moment to maintain that all difficulties connected with the Acts are solved. There are, and there must be, plenty of unsolved difficulties connected with every ancient document, but I think that these two independent investigations will go far to convince men of what, I believe, is clear to everyone who approaches the question unbiassed by *a priori* considerations and without prejudices, that the Acts is a genuine work of a companion of S. Paul. In many cases it is the opponents of the genuineness of a document who are really adopting an apologetic attitude, and I am quite certain that this is the case in regard to the Acts of the Apostles.

(2) The next series of documents I wish to speak about for a moment or two are the Ignatian letters. It is now just ten years since the late Bishop Lightfoot's great work defending their genuineness first appeared, and it is natural that we should ask, What has been the result on critical opinion? Has it, as a matter of fact, won credence for the theories maintained, or is it the case, as one critic asserted, that the mass of the erudition has obscured the weakness of the argument? Now, quite recently, two important treatises have appeared on these letters. One of them is by M. Jean Reville, one of the most distinguished professors in the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes* at Paris. As anyone who examines his recently published work on "The Origin of the Episcopate" will see, he is certainly not prejudiced on the side of traditional or orthodox theology. He has carefully gone over Bishop Lightfoot's ground; in some cases he has strengthened his argument; in any case, he accepts his proof as demonstrative. He considers the genuineness of the Ignatian letters, and their date in the reign of Trajan, one of the fixed points in a difficult investigation.

Our second witness comes from Germany. A young German student, the Freiherr von der Goltz, has published a very careful study of the doctrine of the Ignatian Epistles in Harnack's series of *Texte und Untersuchungen*. He starts with the provisional hypothesis that the letters are probably genuine, but that the date is uncertain. His conclusion is that the evidence of the teaching of the letters goes to show that they date quite from the beginning of the second century. Now, while twenty years ago, to accept the genuineness of the Ignatian letters would have been dangerous to your position as a scholar, at the present day, mainly owing to the labours of Professor Zahn, in Germany, and of Bishop Lightfoot, it has become almost an axiom of criticism that these letters are genuine, that they date from the closing years of the reign of Trajan, and the beginning of the second century. Again, I wish to remind you that all difficulties are not solved, but yet there is, if I may put it so, a very definite position won, and a very clear starting point for any further investigations.

(3) Now, what does this imply? If the Ignatian letters are genuine, and date from the first or second decade of the second century, it implies that over a considerable area

at the beginning of that century—although not necessarily universally—there existed, and existed not as a new invention, a Christianity which was based on the same fundamental doctrinal position on which ours is based, which implied a definite dogmatic position, definite discipline, a Church worship based on the sacraments, a ministry with the three orders quite clearly distinguished, and with a monarchical Episcopate. That is the definite and accepted result of recent research.

Now, I have said that all difficulties are not solved. In the first place, it is quite clear that although the fundamental position is what I have stated it, there are clearly distinctions between the institutions as they were then and as they are now. It is a matter of the very greatest importance that we should have our attention drawn to these distinctions by critics, that we should not be allowed to think that the organization of the early Church represented just that phase of Anglicanism which happens to be predominant in the last decade of the nineteenth century. There are certain broad ecclesiastical principles which go to make up our idea of a Church, and they are, to my mind, undoubtedly primitive; there are certain details in the working out of those principles which we sometimes lay stress on that are as undoubtedly not primitive.

And then again, we have not, of course, yet solved the question of the exact origin of the Christian ministry. That is clearly a more complicated question than was supposed. You have heard one difficult side of it discussed very ably this afternoon—that of "prophets." In another direction, an old idea, that of the identity in the New Testament of the πρεσβύτεροι and ἐπίσκοποι, which was accepted by Bishop Lightfoot, and has generally been held, is now being given up. In the book of M. Reville, to which I have already referred, the difference of the two is very strongly emphasized. I do not profess to be able to decide on this question, nor have I undertaken in this paper to discuss details. What I wish to put before you very clearly and definitely is this, that the conclusions of criticisms, such as are generally accepted, are not detrimental to the Church order which we accept. Those who deny that order are reduced to explaining them away. If you accept the Ignatian letters, and you are bound to do so, it is all but demonstrated that "from the apostles' times there have been three orders of ministry in the Christian Church." There are one or two slight steps further still necessary. Those steps can, I believe, quite well be made, but I do not feel that they can yet be put among the accepted results of criticisms.

(4) Before I conclude, I should like to say a few words of a more general character; firstly about archæology, and then about criticism.

To archæology we clearly owe some of the results which I have emphasized. I am not now referring to the definite Christian results of archæological discovery, as instanced for example by the well known epitaph of Abercius, I am referring to the indirect results of the immense labour which has been bestowed on classical archæology as a whole, and on all the organizations of the Roman empire. We are gradually, through the accurate study of the immense mass of imperial inscriptions which is associated with the name of Professor Mommsen, acquiring so accurate and minute a knowledge of the environments of Christianity, that we have a safe test of almost every document which touches in any way on such matters. Now the Ignatian letters do this in some slight particulars, and in those directions their authenticity has so far been corroborated. One or two small discoveries have strengthened the evidence since Bishop Lightfoot's work was published. The Acts of the Apostles, or rather the latter half of it, bristles with dangerous points, and its authenticity is being more and more closely corroborated. Of the work which may be done in this direction, the latest instance is a very valuable paper by Professor Mommsen on the

military arrangements implied in the whole story of S. Paul's captivity. It does not prove anything for or against the authenticity, for in this case we do not happen to have definite enough knowledge to form a standard; but it shows admirably how, if you accept the genuineness of the Acts, its statements are illustrated by secular history, and may themselves fill up gaps in our knowledge. I have only given a single instance of what might be widely illustrated. Only let me say this, if you want to get a true test which you may use for the date and authenticity of ancient documents, do your best to foster a strong, free, critical archæology, developed independently of Biblical research, which may give an objective standard by which to settle matters.

And one more point, in conclusion, to which I wish to draw your attention—the value of criticism, provided that it is perfectly free and independent. People are sometimes inclined to resent criticism; to call it, without distinction, "rationalistic." Such an attitude is absolutely wrong. Rationalistic means reason used in a wrong way and in cases to which it does not apply. Now the documents which Christianity puts forward as its credentials are clearly just the place in which reason has and ought to work. If they will not stand criticism, where does our evidence lie. To condemn criticism beforehand as rationalistic is quite clearly unwarranted. What is rationalistic in a bad sense of the word is such criticisms as assume, to begin with, that the New Testament revelation is untrue, or which criticise it on *a priori* grounds, which condemn it because it is not what we think it ought to be. But such methods are not only rationalistic, they are unscientific. These we may put aside, warning ourselves, however, that we may find them even in ourselves in some subtle form. But having put them aside, we should accept a free historical criticism as the very best ally of Christianity, if Christianity be true. We must accept it, and not be too ready to condemn it, even if we find its conclusions for a time not always absolutely palatable.

It does two things for us. On the one hand it prevents us holding as primitive what is not primitive. You had an admirable example of this in Dr. James's paper this afternoon. It is always, unconsciously to ourselves, carrying on a critical process, and modifying our current conceptions. And then, secondly, it enables us to hold as primitive what is primitive. We are certainly able, as the result of more than two centuries of vigorous criticism, to hold in a much stronger way than formerly the genuineness of the Ignatian letters, with all that that implies; and we are beginning to discover that, for the greater number of the books of the New Testament, we can say we believe them, not in spite of, but because of, criticism.

PAPER.

(2) Catacombs and other Sources.

The Ven. W. Macdonald Sinclair, D.D., Archdeacon of London, Canon of S. Paul's, etc.

In the present brief paper you do not expect to have a whole, full, and exhaustive account of the catacombs, but a statement of the witness which they give to the feelings, habits, and beliefs of primitive Christianity at Rome.

You will, however, desire to have the roughest possible outline to remind you of what the catacombs are themselves, and what are the limits of the subject.

The name is a composition from two Greek words, κάτα and κύμβη,

a hollow cup or hole going downwards in the earth. It did not originally mean a cemetery. It is now agreed that the Roman catacombs, surprising as it may seem from their enormous extent, are exclusively of Christian work, and they are not to be connected either with the infamous *puticuli*, which were open, and where the corpses of criminals were hurled, or with the *arenaria*, which were sandpits made for building purposes at Rome. The makers of the catacombs always burrowed under the earth, and they always avoided the sandy strata, as they needed the natural walls and roof of rock or stone to support their subterranean galleries. If ever they happened to touch the *arenaria*, they protected their excavations against them by a brick wall. The authority for these views, now generally accepted, is the learned Padre Marchi, followed by the skilful and indefatigable brothers de Rossi.

It was the Jewish colony at Rome that first began to bury in this way, and the Christians followed their example, and that of those who laid our Lord's body in the rocky tomb. The Romans and Greeks originally buried in the earth, till increasing population led, on sanitary grounds, to cremation. A Jewish subterranean cemetery is still accessible on the Via Appia.

The Christians began with small local areas, which they bought, and which often bear the names of the first purchasers; and these they gradually joined and extended below the surface.

Some were constructed in the time immediately after the Apostles, if not actually in those of the Apostles themselves. The ornaments and construction are purely classical, and can bear no other explanation. The chief of these are catacombs of Priscilla, Domitilla, S. Agnes, and Ostrianus. Here we have the earliest monumental evidence of the effects of Apostolical Christianity.

The most ancient Christian inscription is of the third year of Vespasian, that is A.D. 72. In the catacomb of Hippolytus there is one under the Consuls of A.D. 98. There is another under the Consuls of A.D. 107; another under those of A.D. 110. This gives you an idea of the great antiquity of the subject with which we are dealing.

The ancient Church writer Hippolytus, in his *Philosophumena*, says that Bishop Zephyrinus of Rome set one Callistus over the cemetery. This has been identified with the Cœmeterium Callixti, on the Appian Way, mentioned by Anastasius. Bishop Zephyrinus was buried there, as well as thirteen out of the next eighteen bishops of Rome.

Subterranean interment almost ceased by the middle of the fourth century, when Christianity became the established religion. We have therefore to deal with no inscriptions after that time.

A slight element of caution is needed in their study, from the fact that between the years A.D. 366 and 384 Bishop Damasus of Rome was zealous in repairing the catacombs as places of pilgrimage, rich with the bones of martyrs and saints. He had them adorned with exquisitely engraved epitaphs, in large faultless characters, by an artist named Furius Dionysius Philocalus.

In 410 came the taking of Rome by Alaric the Goth, but the catacombs escaped the notice of the invaders.

The example of Damasus was unfortunately followed by other bishops. "The fatal zeal displayed by successive pontiffs in the restoration and decoration of these consecrated shrines is the cause of much perplexity

to the investigator who desires to discover their original form and arrangements. Nothing but long experience and intimate acquaintance with the character of the construction and ornamentation of different periods can enable us to distinguish with any accuracy between the genuine structure of the catacombs as well as the paintings with which they were originally adorned on the one hand, and the work of later times on the other. Many of the conclusions drawn by Roman Catholic writers from the paintings and ritual arrangements of the catacombs as we now find them, and the evidence supposed to be furnished by them as to the primitive character of their dogmas and traditions, prove little worth when a more searching investigation shows their comparatively recent date." *

As to the extent of the catacombs, it was calculated by one learned explorer, Marchi, that their united length would be about 800 or 900 miles; Martigny thought 587; Northcote, 350. It is not accurately known, as they have never been completely explored; in a general way, in the accurate sense of the word, it is immense. The number of graves is estimated at from six to seven millions.

"What insight into the familiar feelings and thoughts of the primitive ages of the Church," says Stanley, "can be compared with that afforded by the Roman catacombs! Hardly noticed by Gibbon or Mosheim, yet they give us a likeness of those early times beyond that derived from any of the written authorities on which Gibbon and Mosheim repose, ... The subjects of the painting and sculpture place before us the exact ideas with which the first Christians were familiar; they remind us, by what they do not contain, of the ideas with which the first Christians were not familiar. . . . He who is thoroughly steeped in the imagery of the catacombs will be nearer to the thought of the early Church than he who has learned by heart the most elaborate treatise even of Tertullian or of Origen."

We will first consider the subjects painted, and then the inscriptions and the doctrines they imply.

The frescoes of the catacombs are illustrations, inestimable in value, of the pure and lofty character of that primitive Christian life of which they were the offspring. They were not realistic and sensuous, but ideal and spiritual, exponents of a mighty spiritual force, as Kügler says, seeking to typify in the earthly and perishing the abiding and eternal. The contest between Pompeii and the catacombs is obvious and instructive: in the one, the degradation and corruption of the Roman Sodom; in the other, an absolutely pure moral atmosphere; the evidences of social life infinitely and immeasurably nobler; a superiority of the lowly, persecuted Christians in all the elements of true dignity and grandeur which is truly incomparable.

The earlier symbolism was taken from accepted artistic Pagan conceptions. "The germs of a new life," says Lübke, "were in embryo in the dying antique world. Ancient art was the garment in which the young and world-agitating ideas of Christianity were compelled to veil themselves." "The earlier paintings are equal to the best specimens of classical art in execution, richness, vigour, and freedom. The later examples declined with the empire, becoming impoverished

---

* "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities."

in conception, stiff in manner, conventional and hieratic in type, till they sink into the barbarism of the Byzantine period." * The early Christian art, as Lübke notes, stripped off what was unsuitable to the new ideas, and retained the healthy germ from which the tree was to unfold its grand magnificence. As Christianity was the very antithesis of Paganism in spirit, so its art was singularly free from Pagan error.

The Biblical scenes were painted with classical figures and costumes and classical accessories; garlands, festoons of flowers, vases of fruit; graceful arabesques, luxuriant vines, grapes, birds, and genii; ideal heads, masks, and fabulous animals; hunting, vintage, and harvest scenes, and pastoral groups; personifications of the hours, seasons, rivers, and the like.

Orpheus charming the wild animals with his lyre typifies Him Whose gracious words drew all men to Himself. Orpheus seeking Eurydice is our Lord triumphing over hell and death, and preaching to the spirits in prison. The Good Shepherd is a benignant youth in the short tunic and buskins of a Roman peasant, sometimes with the rustic pipes in His hand.

But the freedom and beauty of the early pictures did not last long. "Before many years," says Maitland, "the empire of imagination passed away, and the genius of art, with torch extinct and swimming eye, had to mourn over the introduction of the hieratic style, which, wherever it has appeared throughout the world, has cramped and almost annihilated the inventive faculty."

"The later stiff and exclusively ecclesiastical Byzantine art," says Withrow, "enables us to trace the development of religious error, the introduction of unorthodox additions to Christian belief, and the slow progress towards image-worship." It is to this period that most of the condemnations of the abuse of art in the patristic writings must be referred. Towards the close of the fourth century Augustine inveighs against the superstitious reverence for pictures, as well as the growing devotion to the sepulchres, which, he says, the Church condemned and endeavoured to correct. And his contemporary, Epiphanius, even stigmatizes the employment of painting as contrary to the authority of Scripture. Even early in the fourth century, the Council of Elvira prohibited the use of pictures in the churches, lest that which was worshipped and adored should be painted on the walls. At length the practice provoked the iconoclasm of the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, and his successors, and was formally prohibited by the Council of Constantinople in the eighth century.

Contrary to these later developments, the earlier art in the catacombs is symbolical in its character, influenced, as Kügler suggests, in the avoidance of realistic representation by the exemplary fear which pervaded the primitive Church of the least approach to idolatry.

One of the most striking characteristics is the complete avoidance of all images of suffering and woe or of tragic awfulness. There are no representations of the sevenfold sorrows of the Mater Dolorosa, nor mournful Magdalens with skulls as their *memento mori;* no pictures of the Agony and Bloody Sweat, the Cross, Passion, Death, and Burial; no flagellations

---

* Withrow's "Catacombs of Rome."

tortures, fiery pangs of martyrdom. Only images of joy and peace abound on every side. "There is no sign of mourning," says d'Agincourt, "no token of resentment, no expresstion of vengeance—all breathes of gentleness, benevolence, and love." "To look at the catacombs alone," says De Rossi, "it might be supposed that persecution had no victims, since Christianity has made no allusion to suffering." There are "sweet pastoral scenes, fruits, flowers, palm branches, laurel crowns, lambs, and doves—nothing but what suggests a feeling of joyous innocence, as of the world's golden age." *

One of the favourite symbols is S. Paul's conception of hope as the anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast. Another is the heaven-bound ship, as it is called by Clement of Alexandria, the soul seeking a country out of sight. The palm and crown refer to the Christian's victory, and recall the great multitude whom no man can number walking in white and bearing palms in their hands. The dove is very frequent, both as the symbol of peace and innocence; accompanied by such words as innocent soul, simple soul, a little dove without gall. Generally the dove bears an olive branch, the herald of the peace of God, as Tertullian calls it; sometimes it is the Holy Spirit in representations of the baptism of our Lord. The peacock is the emblem of immortality; so is the phœnix. The stag is the soul panting after the water-brooks; the hare is the hunted Christian; the horse means eagerness in the Christian race; the lion fortitude of soul. The vine is the symbol of the union between the believer and Christ; the olive tree, of a life fruitful in good deeds; flowers and fruits, of the future beatitude; a loaf, of the Bread of Life; the lamp and the lighthouse, of the illumination of the Gospel; the balance, of justice; the house, of the tabernacle of the body.

But most of them refer to the Person and work of Christ. The Good Shepherd is seen in countless repetition and variety—rudely scratched on funeral slabs, elaborately carved on sarcophagi, moulded on lamps and vases, graven on seals and rings, traced in gold on glass, and painted in fresco. Sometimes He is seated on a mound as if wearied with fatigue. Sometimes He bears a kid on His shoulders instead of a lamb, to remind us that He came, not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. Sometimes He is a Lamb Himself instead of a Shepherd, and from the mound on which He stands flow streams of water. Sometimes a milk-pail is near the lamb, typifying the wine and milk that we are to buy without money and without price, or the sincere milk of the Word. One of the most frequent and oldest emblems in the catacombs is the fish: Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, Σωτήρ. "This single word," says Optatus, "contains a host of sacred names." Quotations from several of the Fathers show that there is also to be seen in the emblem an allusion to baptism. Sometimes the fish bears a basket of bread and a flagon of wine on its back, or a loaf in its mouth, in which there is a reference to the bread of life, the blood shed for the sins of the world, and their outward and visible signs in the Lord's Supper.

Of the Cross there are very few representations. It was the badge of infamy and shame in Roman civilization to a degree we cannot even

---

* Withrow's "Catacombs of Rome."

imagine; the Christians veiled this sacred sign from the multitude. The fathers delighted in seeing the sign of the Cross in nature; but the first dated example of a simple undisguised Cross does not occur in the catacombs till A.D. 407. It was not till the alleged discovery of the true Cross by the Empress Helena in the time of Chrysostom that it materialized at once, according to Milman, the worship of Christianity. But even then "it was a sign of joy and gladness, crowned with flowers, adorned with precious stones, a pledge of the resurrection, as Milman says, rather than a memorial of the Passion. It was like the rainbow in the cloud to Noah after the flood—a promise of mercy, not a symbol of wrath. It was not the dead Christ, but the glorified Redeemer that the primitive Church presented to the imagination. She lingered not by the empty sepulchre, but followed by faith the risen Lord."*

"The early believers carefully avoided any attempt to depict the awful scenes of Christ's Passion. . . . This solemn tragedy they felt to be the theme of devout and prayerful meditation rather than of portraiture in art. 'The catacombs of Rome,' says Milman, 'faithful to their general character, offer no instance of a crucifixion, nor does any allusion to such a subject of art occur in any early writing.' 'The passion is not represented literally,' says Dr. Northcote, a strenuous advocate of Roman Catholic views, 'but under the veil of secrecy. It is not our beloved Lord, but some other who bears His Cross. The crown which is placed on His head is of flowers rather than of thorns, and corresponds better with the mythical language of the spouse in the Canticles than would a literal treatment.' So also the distinguished Prussian archæologist, Professor Piper, of Berlin. Speaking of the series of art representations belonging to the first five centuries of scenes in the life of our Lord, which extend from His nativity to His appearance before Pilate, he says:—'Further, however, this series does not go; the death and resurrection of Christ have not at all been made the subject of representation in this period.'"*

It may be strange to us to learn, but nevertheless it is true, that the oldest extant representation of the crucifixion is a miniature in a Syrian evangelarium, of the date A.D. 586, now in the Laurentian Museum at Florence. And it was not till the eleventh century that art attempted to portray either the agony or the death of the Son of God.

"In the early ages, and in the fervent glow of primitive faith, no outward symbol was necessary to reveal to the soul the presence of the Divine, or to interpret the profound meaning of the Atonement. The Church required no sensuous image of Him, Whom, having not seen, she loved, to prevent that love from growing cold. As the fervour and purity of faith failed, she relied more on the visible sign to quicken her languid devotion; but not till six centuries of gathering gloom had passed over her head, after her fatal alliance with imperial power, did degenerate art dare to portray to the eye of sense the death pangs and throes of mortal agony of the suffering Son of God. In the church of the catacombs these images of sadness and gloom have no place. All is bright, cheerful, and hope-inspiring." *

It will interest you to hear very briefly the chief Scriptural scenes represented in the pictures. In the Old Testament they are all typical:

---

* Withrow.

the Temptation and Fall, Adam and Eve receiving their sentence, Noah in the Ark, the Sacrifice of Isaac, Moses on Mount Horeb, Moses and the Manna, Moses striking the Rock, the Sufferings of Job, the Translation of Elijah, the three Hebrew Children, Daniel in the Lions' Den, the History of Jonah. In the New we have the Adoration of the Magi, Christ with the Doctors, Christ with the Woman of Samaria, the Healing of the Paralytic, the Healing of the Woman with the Issue of Blood, the Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes, Christ Opening the Eyes of the Blind, our Lord Blessing a little Child, the Raising of Lazarus, the Triumphal Entry, Peter's Denial, Pilate Washing his Hands. The Resurrection and Ascension are only treated under the types of Jonah and Elijah. There are numerous frescoes of seven men eating a repast of bread and fish, recording the appearance to the seven disciples by the sea of Tiberias, and witnessing to the early use and popularity of S. John's Gospel. These are the scenes, all of them typical of the various aspects of Christ's person and teaching, which in these early days impressed most deeply the popular imagination.

With regard to delineation of the Mother of our Lord, "a fresco in the catacombs of Nereus and Achilles, attributed to the second century, is supposed to be the oldest extant art-presentation. In these early pictures she is generally veiled, and expressing dignity and modesty in her attitude and dress, and only in her historical relation to the Divine Child." "The figure of Joseph sometimes completes the group, but generally as a young and beardless man." There are numerous frescoes of persons, both men and women, in the attitude of prayer, called "Oranti," probably representing the persons who were buried in the particular chambers. One of these, standing by a figure of the Good Shepherd, has been mistaken by Dr. Northcote for the Virgin Mary; but it is in reality a martyr, as she has with her the leaded scourge. The first approach to anything like a Madonna has the Greek monogram of Christ on either side, and is not earlier than the fourth century; Martigny, an eminent Roman authority, puts it in the fifth century, after the Council of Ephesus in A.D. 431. It is a half-length, her hands are extended in prayer, she has no nimbus but a veil, and the Divine Child is standing before her. It is only far on, in the seventh century, that Mary gradually is exalted to the place previously devoted to the figure of Christ. "In the eighth century," says d'Agincourt, "the homage paid to her was no longer distinguished from that rendered to the Lord of all."

It remains to speak as shortly as possible of the character of the inscriptions and their teaching. Much might be said of the gilt glasses which are found in such numbers; but from the degraded character of their art they are evidently of a late period, and do not bear on the important period with which we are dealing.

Of the 11,000 extant early Christian monumental inscriptions at Rome, only 1,374 bear dates. The period of the others can be only approximately determined by a comparison with those whose ages are known. De Rossi says that about 6,000 belong to the first four centuries, and are from the catacombs; the rest were found above-ground. Of these 6,000, about 4,000 are before the year 324 A.D., when Constantine became sole emperor.

Only one of the dated inscriptions belongs to the first century, A.D. 71;

two are of the second, A.D. 107 and 111; 23 of the third; 500 of the fourth; about the same of the fifth; 300 of the sixth, principally of its earlier half; and only 7 of the seventh.

The date of birth is seldom given, the day of death as the birth into life eternal being considered the only matter of importance; the length of life is almost invariably shown, frequently with great minuteness. The Christian inscriptions also habitually ignore all mention of the birthplace or country of the deceased, in recognition that the Christian's true country is beyond the grave. In obedience to the command to forsake father and mother in order to follow after Christ, details of family or descent almost never occur.

Throughout these early inscriptions "the distinguished scholarship, laborious research, and archæological skill of such eminent authorities as De Rossi, Pitra, Garucci, and other Roman *savants*, only furnish the weapons for the refutation of many of Rome's most cherished beliefs. . . . The effect of the honest examination of this testimony by a candid mind is seen in the case of Mr. Hemans, the learned author of "Ancient Christianity and Sacred Art in Italy." Though a pervert from the Anglican Communion to that of Rome, and in strong sympathy with many of its institutions, he felt compelled by the historical and monumental testimony of the catacombs, and of early Christian art and literature, to retrace his steps, and, however reluctantly, to condemn and abandon the communion he had espoused."*

The fact is that the inscriptions "offer no warrant whatever for the characteristic doctrines and practice of the modern Church of Rome. There is not a single inscription, nor painting, nor sculpture before the middle of the fourth century that lends the least countenance to her assumptions and erroneous dogmas. All previous to this date are remarkable for their Scriptural character; and it is only after that period that the distinctive peculiarities of Romanism begin to appear."*

The first dated inscription possessing any doctrinal character occurs A.D. 217, and bears on the figment of purgatory. "Prosenes was *received to God*," it says. The next is of A.D. 249, and speaks of the deceased as sleeping. It turns into a Christian form the affectionate acclamations of Pagan monuments:—"Vivas inter sanctis"! (*sic*) "May you live amongst the holy ones." So also one in A.D. 291 has another form of the classical acclamation:—"Refrigera cum spirita sancta" (*sic*), "Refresh thyself among the holy spirits," in the same way that we sing "Forgive, blest shade," without the slightest idea of the departed hearing us, but only to give vent to our own feelings. One in A.D. 310 has "Accersitus ab angelis," "Called away by the angels"; one in A.D. 329 "Laurentius in æternum," "Laurentius was born into eternity." "The primitive Christians had no doubt of the immediate happiness of those who died in faith. They were incapable of the blasphemous thought that the atoning blood of Christ was insufficient to wash away their guilt, and that therefore they were doomed to penal fires." The verbs of "repose" are in the indicative, not the optative: in pace decessit, requievit, ivit ad Deum, quiescis, quiescit—not "*requiescat.*"

In 380 A.D., in barbarous and ignorant Latin, occurs the first use of Ora. "O pray for this thine only child whom thou hast left behind."

---

* Withrow.

"The yearning cry of an orphaned heart" (in the form of the ancient acclamations, and in a lowly and uninstructed class) for the prayers of a departed mother is but a slight foundation for the Romish practice of the invocation of saints. After that date we are less surprised to find a few incorrect sentiments.

Many of the inscriptions are bright with the assurance of the Resurrection. The very idea of death seems to have been repudiated. The catacomb was the *cæmeterium*, the sleeping-place; the vault the *cubiculum*, or chamber of slumber; the body was not *conditum*, buried, but *depositum*, laid down.

The few examples of aspiration for the intercessions of the departed amongst 11,000 inscriptions are, indeed, a flimsy foundation for the Roman doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, and merely indicate the naïve, ignorant beginning from which that doctrine grew up. "If this doctrine," says Bishop Kip, "so much in unison with many of the deepest feelings of our nature, had been held by the primitive Church, we should have found it written broadly and clearly everywhere through these epitaphs. Its proof would not be left to half a dozen inscriptions, which plainly declare the reverse."

Amongst other important doctrines, that of the Divinity of the Son of God and that of the Holy Trinity receive frequent and striking testimony.

It would be interesting to trace the innumerable indications of the delightful charm, simplicity, and beauty of the domestic and social relations of primitive Christianity yielded by the catacombs, reproducing the very life and spirit of the Gospels and Epistles. But it only remains to point out how essential it is that after the long and varying ages through which Christianity has passed, with their different circumstances, traditions, heresies, errors, and excitements, we should from time to time correct our own impressions and review our own ideas about the relative importance of aspects of Christian feeling and practice by going back to this clear and indisputable evidence of those early days when the light still shone bright and pure from the Divine rays of Apostolic truth, and the tones had hardly yet died away that fell from Apostolic lips. Surely we shall not be deluded into speaking of the "dim and distant days of Apostolic Christianity." Of all the periods of the history of the Christian Church they give us the brightest, clearest, purest, and truest. We shall rather be led to declare with Tertullian: "ID ESSE VERUM, QUODCUMQUE PRIMUM; ID ESSE ADULTERUM, QUODCUMQUE POSTERIUS." "That is true in Christianity, whatever was from the beginning; whatever was brought in after the beginning, that is spurious!"

ADDRESS.

(2) THE CATACOMBS AND OTHER SOURCES.

The Rev. HENRY GEE, F.S.A., B.D. Lond., Limborough; Lecturer at Spitalfields; Tutor at the London College of Divinity, Highbury.

THE fifth century, which witnessed so great a change in Christendom at large, marks an entire change in the ministry, doctrine, worship, and art of the catacombs. It may be well, therefore, to confine our attention to the first four centuries of their history, glancing now and then at similar sources of information for the same period.

I.—Looking first at the light thrown upon the ministry of the early Church, we find, at the outset, that we can almost restore the various ranks of the hierarchy from the epitaphs in the catacombs. It so happens that the earliest epitaph of a minister of the Church is that of a presbyter, and dates probably to the second century. In the third century we find several presbyters, always so designated, and never at this date by the name Sacerdos. Sometimes they were married, and one epitaph of a married presbyter dates to the year 389, four years or so after the famous rescript of Pope Siricius in favour of clerical celibacy. Bishops' tombs are found from the third century onwards. I believe it to be purely accidental that no earlier Episcopal monument exists. Deacons, too, are found in the same century. Whilst the laity are constantly referred to under the names Faithful, Brethren, Catechumens, Neophytes, there is no proof of any rigid caste distinction of the clergy; indeed, as late as the third century, one presbyter appears to be a physician. Sub-deacons and acolytes are not earlier than the fifth century, but within our limits we discover exorcists, fossores (or grave-diggers), and readers; whilst amongst the consecrated women we find virgins from the third century, and widows probably from the same time. Further research may disclose earlier instances of the minor orders, for we know, independently, that in the year 250 the Church of Rome had sub-deacons, acolytes, and door-keepers, whilst widows were a recognized order of the Church in very early days. There is no trace of monachism, but here and there we discern a touch of asceticism, or, more strictly, of the Encratism, which is such a conspicuous feature of early Church history. It need scarcely be said that there is no vestige of the supremacy of S. Peter. The Apostle is figured at a comparatively early date with or without S. Paul, but there is no certain instance of any special spiritual *rôle* being ascribed to him before the age of Pope Leo, the founder of the Papacy. In the so-called Papal crypt in the catacomb of S. Callistus, which De Rossi brought to light forty years ago, and in which we come face to face with the tombs of several Popes of the third century, they are still called bishops, and the name Pope first meets us in the next century. This same fourth century, which restricted the title Pope to its present use in the Western Church, gives further evidence of a similar exaltation of the episcopate, for we find the *cathedra*, or Episcopal chair, becoming the special attribute of a bishop. As regards the vestments of the ministers of the Church, the evidence is somewhat ambiguous. It may be doubted whether any distinctive official robe is depicted in the catacombs before the fifth century. Those not in orders appear to have worn the same kind of clothes as the clergy, but these clothes, commonly worn by all in the early centuries, were afterwards retained by the clergy alone when fashions altered, and then the flowing cloak became a kind of surplice, and the black border became the stole. There would, moreover, seem to have been a kind of livery for the mourners at the memorial services, both men and women.

II.—Passing to the doctrinal aspect of the catacombs, a word of warning is necessary if we are to interpret our evidence correctly. These sources of information have been badly treated. We are too apt to try and read our own theological views into them. We must not expect to find in the catacombs of the first four centuries any particular complexion of Catholicism or Protestantism. The result, if you keep your eyes open to all the evidence, will disappoint such an expectation. It cannot be too strongly insisted that the epitaphs, symbols, and frescoes of the catacombs display not scientific theology, but the popular religion; and popular religion may sometimes be inconsistent. Moreover, we have no proof at all that what was written, sculptured, or painted was ever submitted to the approval of ecclesiastical authority. Dominant fashion and individual caprice, then, must be taken into account in

explanation of what we meet. A popular fashion explains the difficulty some have felt about the word *refrigerium*, or refreshment. It was merely a word in popular use to designate the idea of eating and drinking in the kingdom of heaven. There may have been a touch of the chiliasm of the early Church in the introduction of the idea, but it became firmly rooted as a word symbol for the joys of heaven; and purgatory never-entered into the conception at all. Individual caprice will explain the semi-paganism of many inscriptions, in which there is sometimes so strange a mingling of heathen ideas that the reader is prone to suppose that pagans were actually buried side by side with Christians—a supposition which is otherwise impossible. But, after all, this semi-paganism is no worse than the atheism of the poet Gray's epitaph in Westminster Abbey, and almost better than the amiable paganism which people often write now in letters of sympathy and condolence.

But such instances of popular religious conceptions and of individual caprice do not mean that the religion of the catacombs was vague and uncertain. As a rule it is based upon definite facts and definite beliefs. Nothing is more interesting than to trace in the catacombs the constant testimony to the ancient Western Creed, which is everywhere displayed. It is not too much to say that a full grasp of most of the Articles of the Creed is shown in very early times, whilst the omissions are easily accounted for. Thus full belief in each Person of the Blessed Trinity is constantly remarkable, expressed much as in the terms of the Apostles' Creed. The Holy Spirit is often mentioned from the earliest times, and is also symbolized by the "Dove." There was no doubt of our Lord's Deity, for the phrase, "God the Lord Christ" is found long before the Nicene Creed was compiled. It is true that the actual Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension are not represented, but the Old Testament types of these are most familiar—Isaac bearing the wood, Jonah and the whale, Elijah caught up into heaven. These scenes are depicted with an iteration which proves that a dogmatic instinct suggested the choice; and the type rather than the antitype is portrayed, it may be from reverence, it may be to show that the New Testament lies hidden in the Old. If we find no entombment, the catacombs themselves are a witness to the Church's belief in the burial of her Lord, which prompted burial rather than burning at the first, and perpetuated it as the Christian tradition. Of the other articles of the Creed we have clear traces. The Church is represented in various symbols—as a ship wafted by the Holy Spirit, as a matron of holy and winning aspect, and so on; the forgiveness of sins is clearly intended by various representations of baptism, by the healing of the paralytic, and the man born blind; the resurrection of the flesh is suggested by the raising of Lazarus, and is strongly asserted in numerous inscriptions; the life everlasting is constantly declared in the epitaphs. In fact, there is only one article in the Western Creed of the fourth century which is not virtually represented in symbol or expressed in word, and that is the future judgment. It is, however, just possible that the triumphal entry into Jerusalem is a figure of the brighter side of this, representing the Lord coming in His kingdom, whilst Zacchæus in the tree signifies the sinner saved by grace. If so, the darker side is omitted by a natural instinct. It may be added that one article, which found its way into the Creed later on, is everywhere anticipated in the catacombs. The belief in the "communion of saints" existed nowhere more strongly than in the persecuted Church. The solidarity of the Church militant and the Church triumphant is everywhere proved, and the mutual interest of both is evidenced in not a few inscriptions. The perversion of this belief into sacrifice for the dead and intercession of the saints has some faint traces in the period under review; it is the caprice of some, and not the practice of the Church. The Sacraments of the Church are two only. The mention of receiving the Holy Spirit which occurs in the

catacombs, and the phrase "*post acceptam penitentiam*," which is found in a fifth century Gallic epitaph, cannot be twisted into Confirmation and Extreme Unction. Indeed, such practices would scarcely be recorded under the circumstances. With Baptism and Holy Communion the case is different. They are constantly spoken of, symbolized, or depicted. Their efficacy is clearly intended by the choice of the representations. Thus, Moses at the rock and the ark on the waters are third-century figures of baptism, and others occur later on. The Baptism of our Lord is painted in the second century. It should be noted, too, that the practice of infant baptism is confirmed by the catacombs. Then the Holy Communion has its appropriate symbols—the fish and the basket of bread, and others; whilst the meal on the shore, in the last chapter of S. John, may signify the same, or it may prefigure the heavenly feast. In no sacramental scene or mention is there any precise evidence of Eucharistic doctrine. There is certainly no prostration or adoration in the frescoes, but as certainly the real grace of the sacrament is always made clear.

III.—As regards the general worship of the early Church, there can be little direct evidence in fresco or inscription, but one point deserves mention, namely, the memorial use of the little chapels which are found in the catacombs. Let it be said that many of these are late, but that some apparently date to the fourth century. It is frequently said that Mass was offered in these chapels from the earliest times. The date just mentioned disproves this assertion. What took place seems to have been this. The graves of the dead would be visited on anniversaries and at other times, from the first, in accordance with ordinary Roman usage. The Christians felt no objection to the meal usual on such occasions, but rather invested it with a symbolical character, and very likely held some service and celebrated an agape, or love-feast. All this took place at first in the *cellæ* above the catacombs, an example of which is still seen in the cemetery of Domitilla. But later on it would seem to have become the fashion to dig out spaces below, in which these meetings were held, close to the grave of the martyr or departed friend, though no exact date can be given for the commencement of the practice. The use of such chapels, at the first, may be illustrated by a recently recovered North African inscription, which runs, "Here is the house of our God Christ; here is the dwelling of the Holy Spirit; here is the memorial of the blessed martyr, Consultus; here shall everyone be heard who calls upon the Name of God." That legend dates to the days of S. Cyprian, and I do not know any reason for believing it to be otherwise than a fair representation of the purpose of martyr chapels when they originated. It was a descent from this simple and primitive use to the celebration of sacrificial rights upon the slabs of the tombs within the catacombs, perhaps as early as the third century, but more probably from the fourth.

It is easy to assert the early beginnings of the practice, but at present there is no sufficient proof of any such celebration before the fourth century, when the days of persecution were over, and it was a growing fashion to venerate the martyrs, and go on pilgrimage to their tombs. The *Liber Pontificalis* assigns this practice of subterranean Mass to the third century, but the authority of that book is very questionable. Baronius has no real proof earlier than the end of the fourth century, and as he is not likely to push the date down too low, we may take the fourth century as the earliest which we can safely accept.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I HAVE had no cards sent in to me at all. I cannot say that I am very much surprised, because it is not a very easy subject for the clergy and the laity to speak upon without considerable preparation. The question is, therefore, what is my duty? Is it my duty to call upon some of our friends to address us, or is it my duty to fill up the time by speaking to you myself? Now, I suppose you will all agree with me that I am the best judge of my own duty, and I certainly think it is my duty not to fill up the time myself, but to call upon some of our friends to address the meeting, and I hope they will consider it their duty to respond to the invitation of the President of the Congress. I will now call upon the Dean of Chichester

---

The Very Rev. R. W. RANDALL, D.D., Dean of Chichester.*

As I am called upon, I suppose it is my duty to try and say something upon this very interesting subject—deeply and thoroughly interesting it is. You seem to have been living for some time in communion with those glorious souls who, when the power of the Holy Ghost was at its highest, were drawn into the Church of Christ. You have been hearing—as I understood from the words that I caught as I entered this hall—some very plain proofs that what we call in its true sense the Catholic faith—namely, that which embraces all the great doctrines which were delivered by our Lord to the Church—is illustrated by the representations to be found in the catacombs. It is a great thing that we should remember that. But from the manner of these representations, as they were described, it is possible that we might overlook something which is taught by the representations. Undoubtedly there was a great restraint in the manner of these early representations; but it cannot, I suppose, for a moment be imagined that the Holy Spirit of God had nothing to do with the mind and heart of the Church as time went on. Amongst the things which have touched me, I think, the deepest, in reference to Divine truth in Holy Scripture, nothing has moved my heart more than that strange sentence in which we are told that the blessed Virgin Mary kept all the things that were told her, and "pondered them in her heart." Surely if there was, for a time, repression in the expression of the devotional life of the Church, it was because the heart of the Church was so touched by all the incidents of our Lord's life, that it was burning for the time to come when there might be a more manifest setting forth, through all that appeared to the eye and ear of men, with reference to all that concerned the life and sufferings of Christ. Thus, in the earliest times, hymn-writing and preaching did not occupy the position in the worship of the Church that they afterwards did; so that there was something left afterwards for the hymn-writer and preacher to declare to the Church, when the things that were pondered in the hearts of early Christians sunk deeper and deeper in later times. So, surely, there was a great work for the consecration of Christian art; and we should be making a great mistake if we forgot that the nineteenth century was not the fourth; and it would be misleading if we supposed that there was no new way of bringing forward the old truths. Who would give up those old representations which covered the walls of our churches, and that were to be found in the windows of our churches—that have been traced by the hands of holy artists—which so much appealed to modern Christian mind and feeling—the representations of the death and manifold sufferings of Christ on the Cross? One of the saints of the Church was won by a representation of the story of the Cross, at the age of six years. She was standing by her sister, and her sister—pointing to the representation—tried to tell her something of the story of the Cross; and the young child said, "Did He do that for us? Oh! what can we do for Him?" The representation before the eye of the child so touched that young heart that, in the trying times of family life, her husband, who hardly knew what love was, was won by her; and when she came to die, and the news was brought to her that her husband had been killed in battle, she lifted up her hands to heaven, and said, "I thank Thee, Lord, for one more thing to suffer for Thee."

---

* The revised proof of this speech did not reach the publishers before the time alotted for the publication of the Report.

The Very Rev. Wm. LEFROY, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

THERE are three very important documents which have been recently brought to light, and to which a distinct reference was made, namely, the "Didache," the "Apology of Aristides," and the "Recognition of S. Peter." I do not profess to be able to go into each sentence or word of each of those documents, with the care which the Rev. Professor Robinson evidently bestows upon them, or Archdeacon Sinclair bestows on the catacombs, but I would merely say that I have been greatly impressed by the study of these interesting expressions of primitive Christianity, and I think that whatever our theological proclivities may be respecting these documents, you will agree that they do not in the least degree do other than confirm the order and doctrine of the Church of England as it is known to us to-day. Something has been said, not to-day, but at other times, with regard, for instance, to the enjoyment and observance of the daily administration of the Holy Eucharist. For myself, I can honestly say that if the spiritual state of a soul is such that it is desirable, why should it be denied? But when I turn to the "Didache," I do not find any trace of that; but I do find that the observance of the Lord's Supper was weekly. It is a very important point of that document, which is said to date from the year 100 by some, and is stated by Zahn, the great Roman Catholic critic, to be earlier, that the Lord's Supper was celebrated every Lord's Day. Surely, as Christians who desire to get back as much as we can to all that is primitive, believing it to be both Scriptural and Apostolic, we will recognize this as an appeal for a weekly celebration in every parish on the Lord's Day. Then there is another thing which is brought out to us from these early documents—and I am now dealing with the "Didache"—that there was at this time a form of itinerant as well as a localized ministry; and I want to know why we cannot have an itinerant ministry now, in conjunction with the parochial ministry. Would it not be of the greatest importance? My loyalty to the parochial system is absolutely unlimited, because I believe it to be the surest method of reaching the masses, but together with this, we do want an itinerant ministry. We want the assistance of those to whom God has given rare powers of evangelistic expression. We want men to go into parishes to preach for the glory of God, and for the well-being of men; to tell them that there is a place in heaven for every man, and that every man may be saved by looking to the Lord Jesus Christ. Then there is another thing brought before us in this new document—the antiquity of Episcopacy. At the close of the first century it "was on the wing." I cannot but think that this is a matter of the greatest importance, and, taken in connection with Bishop Lightfoot's essay on the Christian Ministry, it surely is strong proof as to the antiquity of this order, which we thank God is held most highly in our Church. With regard to the "Apology of Aristides"—about which Professor Robinson transfixed us in Norwich Cathedral, by the masterly discourse upon it—go through the whole of that Apology, and you may do it in an afternoon, and you will not find a sentence or a word which in the least is inconsistent with the doctrines of the Church of England. The same may be said of the "Recognition of S. Peter." All this leads us to believe that the nearer we get to these ancient documents the nearer are we to Christianity when it was purest; and I believe that the purer Christianity is, the more powerful will Christianity be; and that precisely in proportion to your loyalty to its purity will be your lawful expectations of its potentiality. In corrupt Christianity you have a thing that may be buried out of sight. There is nothing with which men are so impatient as the corruption of a dead faith. But let the faith of the English Church—and I believe it is the most powerful, comprehensive, and purest Church the world has ever seen since the Pentecost—let its faith be observed, and its doctrines faithfully preached, and I believe, notwithstanding the complications of the nineteenth century, and they are many, notwithstanding the difficulties that come to us from this side and that, we have but to keep to the truth as it is in Christ, and speak the truth in love, and the most glorious future is before the Church of England.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I DO not propose to call upon anyone further to address the meeting. I will just wind up the discussion by making one or two very brief remarks which have occurred to me during its course. One point that occurred to me which has been brought out

by former speakers has been this: that inasmuch as modern discoveries, both archæological and literary, have led us in such a very great degree to go back to the old theories which were held years ago, and which some of our people thought were in some slight degree discredited, surely we learn from this the very important lesson, not to be impatient with regard to the various asserted discoveries of modern times; nor to be in a hurry to think that new theories have been proved. Though not quite an old man—at least I do not admit myself to be so—I am old enough to have heard a great many of these new theories brought forward and discussed, partly accepted, and then after all rejected. It was but the other day, for example, that a friend of mine who is here present, was saying to me that the last assertion among the German critics is, that after all that has been said, the Epistle to the Hebrews was really written by S. Paul. That is the old idea, and for many years was quite discredited. In various ways we seem coming back to the old conservative ideas of authorship of the Holy Scriptures and regarding many matters connected with the Church's ministry, doctrine, and worship; and probably it would be just the same if we held our judgment in suspense with regard to the higher criticism of the Old Testament. Among some of our modern writers the justice of all the conclusions of the new schools of criticism has been too hastily assumed, for there is already a reaction beginning, and you see that you must not depend too exclusively upon analytical researches of those who are skilled in the languages; but we must wait awhile, for there are other considerations to be brought forward, considerations with regard to the value of tradition; considerations as to how soon tradition becomes imperfect if it be not written; considerations derived from common sense. We must not too hastily assume that the first conclusions of these new writers will be ultimately justified. With regard to the Ignatian Epistles, for example, I can remember very well, when I was a student of theology, it was supposed the Ignatian Epistles were of little value, but now it has been ascertained they are of the utmost value, and the conclusions which have been set forth by Bishop Lightfoot have been accepted by the best scholars. In passing from that, I would like to ask you all to study the Ignatian Epistles for yourselves, not only the clergy, but the laity. You can all obtain the book. The Ignatian Epistles are most valuable, and are greatly confirmatory of the faith, and confirm very strongly indeed our own views of Church government, and they show how some of the doctrines, which perhaps were not so frequently set forth as we thought in the New Testament, were certainly set forth very frequently indeed in the documents which succeeded the writings of the New Testament. Although the Epistles of Ignatius are not longer than the Gospel of S. Mark, yet you will find some seven, eight, or nine allusions to the Holy Eucharist and its doctrines, and that is a very important point. It is spoken of parenthetically and incidentally as being the usual worship of the Church of Christ. The Epistles are very interesting, very pious, and full of good doctrines, and I wish very much that the clergy and laity who wish to be informed of the history and doctrines of the English Church would spend a little time in reading, in English, Bishop Lightfoot's Epistles of Ignatius. There is only one further remark with which I will trouble you before dismissing the meeting, and that is a remark, to me very interesting, which has been already put before us by Archdeacon Sinclair, that the catacombs on the whole decidedly represent to us a very happy and a very joyous religion. There can be no doubt about that. You might think that it would be otherwise, and that there would be an air of gloom, despondency, or sorrow about the catacombs. If there be any despondency at all, it is connected with the idea of light once taken away by death; but the whole atmosphere of religion as set before us in the catacombs is of a joyish character. I can understand that better than you can from the fact that I have lived so much in heathen lands. I spent, as you know, some years of my life among the heathen, and I have travelled in other heathen countries, such as the wonderful country of China. These early Christians were living under a heathen system; they were living in the midst of Pagan rule; they saw what heathenism was. A great many of them had been brought up as heathens, and had been converted; or if they had not been heathen, a great many of them had friends and relatives who still were heathen. Recognizing, then, the misery of heathenism, seeing all its abominations around them, feeling the utter hopelessness of heathenism, which gives no hope for the world beyond the grave, can you not understand what a spring of life and happiness and joy there was to all those who were persuaded to accept the blessed peace-giving doctrines of the Gospel of Christ? I would like to put that before you as a last thought. Many of you, my dear friends, I should

be inclined to think find that your religion is not of that happy and joyous character which you wish it were. Your religion is perhaps of a somewhat despondent kind. Try to realize this thought; suppose you had been brought up in a heathen land—suppose in China—and think what Christianity has been to you. Realize its blessedness; realize how it brings present peace—the peace of God which passeth all understanding, the assurance of sin forgiven; see how Christianity takes from you the dread of death. Death to the heathen is a miserable thought. When they think of death they are like looking out into the dark night, from which they see nothing, and from which they turn away with a desponding heart. Whereas to us, who believe in Jesus, the fear and gloominess of death is taken away. Our blessed religion gives us hope beyond the grave; so that in reality, if we look at it from that point of view, we shall see that our religion is a religion of hope, peace, and joy. Well may the Apostle bid us "rejoice in the Lord alway, and again I say, Rejoice." You and I know what religion is, and we ought now to be happy in the blessed truth of the Gospel, which gives us that liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

S. ANDREW'S HALL.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 9TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of LICHFIELD in the Chair.

EDUCATION.

PRESERVATION OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN SECONDARY AND HIGHER SCHOOLS, AND COLLEGES.

PAPERS.

The Rev. HENRY WACE, D.D., Principal of King's College, London.

THE Preservation of Religious Education in our Secondary and Higher Schools and Colleges is at least as important as its preservation in our Elementary schools, and in some respects it is of even higher importance. The age at which youths and young men and women attend our higher schools and colleges is at once an age at which they are peculiarly open to the influence of religious truth, at which they are specially liable to the influences which obscure it, and at which they most need its guidance and control. It is an age at which, in more respects than one, a new moral and intellectual world dawns upon the vision of young people, and when they are every day feeling their way into relation with it. It is the age to which the Divine Wisdom of the Book of Proverbs is primarily directed, "to give prudence to the simple, to the young man knowledge and discretion." It is an age at which the cry placed in the mouth of the Patriarch, at the outset of human experience, rises involuntarily from earnest minds: "O where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?" They stand at the shore of the vast and perilous ocean of human passion and thought; they need a compass to direct them, and they are, consciously or unconsciously, craving for it. They are daily entering, whether they will or no, and whether their teachers will or no, upon new moral experience, and

encountering unknown moral problems. Upon the manner in which they meet that experience and those problems their whole career in this world, as well as in the next, depends; and the first and highest duty of those who are responsible for their education is to give them the guidance they need amidst these matters of moral life or death. For the same reason they are able to enter, in a higher degree than children, into the meaning and practical bearing of Christian truths. There is a great deal of Christian truth which it is difficult to explain to those who have had no practical experience of the realities with which it deals. It is like physical science in this respect, that much of it can only be apprehended by the aid of experiment; and some of the deepest of Christian truths require not only to be heard, but, in S. John's words, to be "seen with the eyes, to be looked upon, and handled with the hands," before they can be appreciated. Now youths and young men and women are entering on this stage of actual experience, and they are consequently better able, year by year, to understand what the Christian Creed means, and what is its practical bearing on life. Year by year they become more capable of understanding that the great truths we wish to teach them are not merely dogmas, but facts. It is possible to make them realize more and more, year by year, that the Christian Creed reveals the central facts in the history of mankind, and the central facts in their own position; that its revelations are "the lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth." In proportion as this is brought home to them, their interest in these great truths, and their grasp of them, is strengthened, and their whole moral and religious nature is deepened. Of course religion and theology may be taught without being brought into this living touch with experience, and so may every other subject, whether intellectual or moral. It depends, as a rule, upon the moral and religious life of the teacher himself whether the moral and religious life of his students is evoked by the truths they are taught. But this is what religious education means, and it is this of which the preservation in our higher schools and colleges is of such vital consequence. It will be enough to specify one single aspect of Christian truth in order to illustrate its vital importance in education. Why do we wish young men and women, as well as little children, to be taught the cardinal truths of the Christian Creed respecting the nature of our Lord? Not merely because of their dogmatic truth; not merely because they are true theology and true philosophy; but, above all, because it is essential that young people should understand that Jesus Christ is their Lord in this world and in the next; and, moreover, that He is their living Saviour, the only Person in heaven or in earth Who can save them from the evils by which they are beset, and give them, or restore to them, here or hereafter, perfect soundness in heart and mind, in body and soul. If, as we believe, He is the one Saviour of every child, of every young man and woman with whom we have to deal, it is not a question of the abstract merits of dogmatic teaching, it is a question of common sense, common faithfulness, and common charity to bring that truth home to them, and to impress it upon them at the most critical period of their lives as the most important of all truths. The first word of the Book of Proverbs to young men is that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," and the last word of the last Apostle to his little children is

that "we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." A school or college which did not teach its students that Queen Victoria is the ruler of this country would be a very imperfect, if not a disloyal institution; and from a Christian point of view, any school or college is similarly, but far more imperfect, in which students are not taught that Jesus Christ is their Lord and Saviour, that their whole allegiance is due to Him, and that the salvation of their whole moral and religious life depends on their living in obedience to Him, in trust on Him, and in daily communion with Him. In youth and early manhood and womanhood, just when the heart is opening to the deepest affections, when the mind is most susceptible to truth, and at the same time when both heart and mind are most easily betrayed and beguiled, then is the period when those who have the charge of education are most imperatively and most solemnly bound to bring the hearts and minds of their students into the closest possible communion with the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, on these supreme realities of life.

Such is the importance of the preservation of Christian teaching in our higher schools and colleges. Against what dangers have we chiefly at the present time to secure it? The greatest of all dangers lies, of course, in the failure of Christian men to grasp the importance of the principles thus stated, and in those schisms among them which prevent their uniting in the support of this great cause. Under the influence of these schisms and of the legislation which was rendered necessary by it, it is to be feared that much ground has been lost in the preservation of religious teaching in our ancient Universities and Colleges. It may have been gained in one direction, but it has been lost in others. Young men and women are not as generally taught as in great Christian foundations they ought to be, that Christian truths are the foundations of all other truth and of all life, that the primary truths of morality, the primary truths of history, the primary principles of human society, are laid down in the Scriptures, by the Prophets, by our Lord, and by His Apostles; and that whoever wishes to understand, not merely theology, but morality and human nature, must start from the facts and truths of the New Testament. They are treated too much as one set of truths among others, which may be kept apart as a separate subject of thought, while the rest are independently studied. So far, however, as our ancient Colleges and Universities are concerned, all we can hope at present is, that the absolute liberty of teaching which has been granted will itself work out a remedy for any mischief that may have been occasioned by it, and that experience will more and more establish the conviction that Christian truth is the key to all other truth, and that to teach or study morals or history on any other basis than that of the Christian Creed is like teaching natural philosophy without regard to Newton's laws of motion.

But with respect to modern foundations and to the large number of Secondary schools throughout the country which are awaiting the hand of legislation, there is much which demands our action and our vigilance. There is, in the first place, hardly any object on which Christian liberality would be better bestowed than in founding and supporting

institutions for Secondary and Collegiate Education, in which the instruction of the students in the Christian religion is made an indispensable part of the regular course of training, subject only, in certain circumstances, to the qualification of a Conscience Clause. It is eminently desirable that institutions for this purpose should, as far as possible, be placed in a position which renders them independent of State support, with the control and interference that support may involve; and, when one remembers what has been done in America for the foundation of Universities, it does not seem too much to hope that some similar liberality may be evolved among Churchmen, in an increasing degree, for the purpose of establishing throughout the country institutions in which a complete Christian education may find a permanent home. I should be ungrateful if I did not mention King's College, London, as one such institution, and I trust that the position it holds may be more and more recognized, supported, and imitated. But, at the same time, it is inevitable that the State, which has acquired such a comprehensive control of Elementary Education, should lay its hand more and more upon Secondary Education; the Report of the Commission which has been investigating that subject is, at this moment, anxiously expected; and the necessity under which the University Colleges of Great Britain have found themselves of applying for annual grants from Parliament gives the Legislature a special right of interference with them. In these circumstances, we have to guard against a danger similar to that by which the teaching of religion in Elementary schools is menaced. It is maintained by a powerful and earnest party that the enjoyment of public money, or what may be regarded as public endowments, should be coupled with the condition either that no religious requirement should be imposed upon teachers and managers, or that no teaching should be given which is characteristic of any particular Christian communion. Now, bearing in mind the immense influence and immense resources of the Government, it is inevitable that the general enforcement of such conditions as these should be most prejudicial, if not fatal, to the full and free development of the higher Christian education. As to the former, the first and most indispensable security for Christian education is that the teachers should be Christians. It is a security which men would not fail to take in the case of any other subject. If you wanted young men brought up in sound habits of thought or practice in any other branch of life, you would take care that they were under the guidance of men who, both by instruction and example, would influence them aright in such a matter. Institutions founded for the express purpose of Christian education cannot dispense with some such security; and if public money were to be refused, as was done in one instance under the late Government, to institutions in which any religious qualification whatever was required from the teachers, a grievous disability would be inflicted on them. It may seem, at first, more plausible to require, as has, I am told, been done in some schemes for Welsh Foundations, that while religious teaching is allowed, it should not be that of any particular communion or denomination. But any such schemes will be found impracticable, because they ignore a characteristic fact of religious life. As a matter of fact, whether men like it or not, Christian life and Christian teaching have developed into certain forms, and, in proportion

to their earnestness, the great majority of Christian men and women are attached to one or other of those forms. Christians, in other words, form societies, and their practical life is dependent upon those societies. Churchmen belong to the great Society of the Church; they endeavour to live according to the Church's rules, and their faith is guided by the Church's teaching. They cannot teach freely and fully without being free to teach the principles and practices of their own Communion, and they are denied a vital liberty if those to whom their children are entrusted are not allowed the same freedom. It is shutting our eyes to life, and trying to make a world of our own, to argue that certain truths may be selected from those professed by the various Christian communities, and taught as the common property of all. You cannot get such a system taught. No sufficient number of persons, perhaps no persons, are agreed upon it; and for the purposes of practical work it does not exist. If you wish religion to be taught, it must be taught by the organized societies who are prepared to teach it, and it must be taught, in the first instance, by the largest and most important Society of all in England, the Church of England. That Church has always been loyal to the civil authority; and, so far as it can, it will always be ready to consider the wishes and necessities of the State, and to defer to them; nor would it question the right of the civil authority to take care that religion is not so taught as to interfere with secular duties and obligations. But, on the whole, if a Church is to teach religion, it must teach its own religion, and not one prescribed to it by the State. Mr. Gladstone has said that the State holds no commission to teach religion, and it may be added that still less does it hold any commission to curtail the teaching of religion and to limit its methods. In short, if you wish the teaching of those religious truths of which I have spoken to be effective and vital, you must give the Church, and other religious bodies also, full liberty to teach them, to the best of their apprehension of them, without curtailment, and without any attendant disability. The practical means by which such teaching is given, is by the foundation of institutions in which the managers and the teachers are pledged to the principles of the Church of England, or of some other Communion—in the current phrase, which are under denominational management; and the practical principle for which we have to contend is that such institutions should be under no disability whatever in respect to the enjoyment of public money and public privileges in consequence of their religious management alone. The whole struggle respecting Elementary Education is becoming concentrated on this point, and the vital controversy respecting Secondary and University Education centres round the same point. Let the State take whatever precautions it thinks proper in order to ensure that the secular instruction given in Schools and Colleges enjoying public endowments, whether permanent or annual, is thoroughly satisfactory; but let it impose no disability on such institutions in respect of their management for the purposes of religious education. There is, indeed, some danger of undue interference by the Government with the freedom of teaching even in secular subjects. It would be a grievous pity if the variety which has hitherto marked our English Public Schools and Colleges should be replaced by an official uniformity. But any such attempt in the sphere of religious teaching would only not be fatal because it could not possibly be successful.

The decision of the Treasury, announced this week, to restore to King's College, London, the grant of which it had been deprived on the ground of the religious qualifications required from its teachers, affords welcome evidence that the present Government is resolved to uphold this principle of allowing perfect free play to religious education. The aim, in short, towards which our efforts as Churchmen should be directed, is that of allowing perfect freedom to religious foundations, subject only to the requirement of their secular efficiency. The education of young men and young women to meet the great realities of life cannot be adequately secured by any system in which the moral and religious instruction is dependent on the State. But allow the Christian Church and Christian Societies to develop, without discouragement or disability, the Christian education which they have been charged by their Master to impart, and they will foster in the country a vigorous moral and religious life, while promoting the highest efforts of secular and scientific learning.

The Rev. HENRY MEYNELL, Provost of Denstone; and Prebendary of Lichfield.

THE subject before us is the Preservation of Religious Education in Secondary and Higher Schools and Colleges. And the first question is, What do we mean by religious education? for the term conveys different ideas to different minds. But in this Church Congress I hope I shall carry most of you with me when I say that religious education, however understood, should be definite, distinct, dogmatic, in full accordance with the teaching and the formularies of our Church, and especially of the Church catechism.

I do not believe in toning down truth to suit the tastes of the different denominations of religionists amongst whom, through our unhappy divisions, Englishmen are divided. The Church of the Living God is the pillar and ground of the truth, and truth she must teach in her schools—the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. And what is truth? Again and again Pilate's question meets us everywhere; and One who stood bound before Pilate gave, and still gives, the answer, "I am the Truth;" the truth we must teach to our children is the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

Yes, we Churchmen know the answer to that question, "What is Truth?" The creeds of Christendom enshrine it, the creed of Athanasius declares it, "This is the Catholic Faith, which, except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved." And so, in education as in all things, in education above all things, "other foundation can no man lay than is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

You cannot begin too early to teach the young ones in our schools the doctrine of the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, the truth of the Incarnation, with all that it involves. It is foolish, it is false to say that such mysteries of faith are too high, too holy, too abstruse for our young ones to receive—

> "O say not, dream not, heavenly notes to childish ears are vain,
> That the young mind at random floats and cannot catch the strain."

The faith of children is wonderful, of such is the kingdom of heaven. A writer in *The Times* lately told us that "Our Lord took little children

in His arms and blessed them, but He did not discourse to them of the mysteries of religion." I do not know whether He did or did not, but this I know, when He Himself was a little child the teachers of Israel were astonished at His questions and His answers. And so I say, begin with the youngest, teach each boy in every school from the very first who he is, and what he is, and what he has to do; teach him that through his birth he is a fallen son of Adam; teach him that through his baptism he is a regenerated son of God, a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that as God's son and Christ's member he must keep himself pure and unspotted, and work for his Father, and help his fellow-men for the love of the living Christ, in Whom all men are brothers. He must be told of the power of the Resurrection, of the power which he has within him as a member of the risen Lord, a power which was given at his Baptism; a power which will be renewed when the Holy Ghost comes down upon him at his Confirmation; a power which he will receive again and again when, after Confirmation, he strengthens and refreshes his soul in the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. He must be told for his soul's encouragement how strong he is in the Lord and in the power of His might—how weak without Christ, how powerful with Him. It is not enough to teach boys in our schools morality; the Ten Commandments are good, the Sermon on the Mount is even better, but how is the poor boy to keep the one or to work out the other, unless you go on to show him how through the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and its extension to us through the sacraments he may have help and strength and grace to do and to be all that God made him for? And so in our schools of the Church let us teach, as we are bound to teach, the whole of the Catholic Faith and all that it involves, and offer the means of grace, freely and in their entirety, to all who enter our walls. I know that some object to this. I know that head-masters in our great public schools are, in some cases, declaring that they think it best not to teach the distinctive doctrines of the Church to all their boys at all times—indeed, under the working of the Endowed Schools Act, it is perhaps questionable whether they may do so; but some tell us that they feel it to be not expedient, even were it lawful. They say they cannot teach definite doctrine in a public school because it is a public school, and all sorts of parents, believers and unbelievers, send their children to it. They say they must not teach anything that will offend anyone (as if that was possible); so that we scarcely know what is being taught to our children in such schools—but it hardly can be the whole counsel of God.

Let them look to the rock from whence they were hewn, to the hole of the pit from whence they were digged. Who were the founders of those schools? What say their statutes? Are they, or are they not, schools of the Church? and is it just to the sons of believers to keep from them portions of God's truth for fear of offending some non-believers? Is the Church boy to be sacrificed to the non-Church boy, and that in a Church school? It is cruel to hide from a child that which may help to save his soul; it is shameful to keep back from him those means of grace which join him to his Saviour, and free him from his sins. Give them all you have, teach them all you know. "Let knowledge grow from more to more, but more of reverence in us

dwell." God grant that this may be more and more the spirit of our age, that man from childhood may reverence God, and learn that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom.

Such, then, is the religion which we have to teach; and, as our next point, who are to be the teachers?

When on earth, Christ the Teacher of teachers taught personally Himself; He was daily in the Synagogue; He spoke at public gatherings; He taught on the mountains, and by the sea-side. He was ever about this, as His Father's business.

At first He said to His followers, "I am the Light of the World"; then, when about to leave them, He changed the word and said, "Ye are the Light of the World"; and from those first followers He selected representative men, twelve at first, more afterwards, and He sent them to be teachers under Himself as the Head-teacher. "Go ye," He said, "into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature;" "Go, teach all nations;" "Feed My sheep, feed My lambs;" "Let your light shine," the light ye have from Me, and be ye as I am, the Light of the World. Then He said, "As My Father sent Me, even so send I you," and ye must send others, so it is implied, to carry on the Teacher's work when I am gone and you are gone, and "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."

Here we have the old charter of the Church as the world's educational society, and by this action Christ ordained for all ages a teaching body; He gave some apostles (bishops as we now call them), some evangelists (mission preachers), some pastors (parish priests), and some teachers—that is schoolmasters—that one and all might reach through their teaching to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, and become a perfect, Christ-like, God-like man. So, in our schools, head-teachers should be as they once were, ordained men; and education should be directed mainly, though not solely, by the clergy, as the authorized instructors of the young.

I fear in this respect the Church has lost ground of late years, and religion in public schools and colleges is suffering in consequence. But the remedy rests in the hands of School Governors, who, in their appointments, should carefully select headmasters who hold the faith of our fathers, and are duly ordained and authorized by the Church as teachers of youth. But clerical schoolmasters do not meet all the spiritual needs and requirements of boys in a public school. A school, like a parish, needs its pastor and evangelist, as well as its teachers; and in the life of a public boarding school, as in all communities where human beings, be they men or boys, are massed together, there are special dangers and temptations; and during the critical time of developing boyhood into manhood, youth needs special personal help. The young heart yearns for sympathy, the tried and tempted spirit craves for counsel, the sin-loaded soul longs to open its grief and be comforted. To meet these special needs it would be well if each school had its own chaplain, an earnest, prudent, loving man, set apart for this very purpose; one who is not associated in the eyes of the boys with the sterner requirements of school discipline and school punishments, but one to whom they may have free and friendly access at all times, and to whom they may look for all they want when caring for their souls. For in this provision we should find a special safeguard against dangers which in

this age seem very great, and against sins learnt at school which have saddened many a young man's life, and have haunted him till death. Nor do I think that any headmaster, who is wise and humble-minded, would object to the presence of a chaplain as interfering with his own office, duties, and responsibilities; it is true that the headmaster is in *loco parentis* to every boarder in his school—but consider how fully a headmaster's time is occupied with endless details of school management; how can he possibly give attention to individual cases, watch, guide, guard, the multitude of young souls around him? Let him be all that Arnold was to Rugby—and even then more is wanted; let him see to his sixth, to his prefects; but there are also the younger boys, the candidates for Confirmation, and the assistant masters; and the servants also, they too need care—he cannot be all things spiritually to them all. Gladly, surely, should he welcome the assistance of an earnest priest, who shall be *totus in hoc;* not merely the chaplain for his boys, but his own friend and guide and counsellor, his right hand in all that he and his colleagues have to do for God and the Church.

And the other masters of the school, clerical and lay, they, too, have their work in this matter of religious education; if they do not see it, let the headmaster and the chaplain show them where it lies, and how to do it. For example, let them teach Church history, and teach it thoroughly, beginning with the Acts of the Apostles; no better Church defence than this—Church history taught practically, to the masses. And on Sunday let assistant masters teach religion, directly or indirectly, each according to his own light. The observance of Sunday at school is always a difficult question; assistant masters if they like may do much to solve it. The music master, for example, if he has reverence and tact, may come to the front on Sunday evenings, and make sacred music no small element in the religious teaching of the Day of Rest.

We have thought about the teaching and the teachers; now may I say one word about the place where the teaching is carried on? First, the chapel. Let it stand out in all its noble proportions, to bear its witness visibly for Christ and His Church. Towering up above the secular buildings which surround it, let it be in itself an educating power, an intellectual landmark, teaching to man and boy alike the supremacy, the greatness, the solitary, unapproachable, magnificence of God; teaching in one word, reverence. And woe be to that man or that boy who has no reverence, who sees nothing higher than himself, and loves nothing better than himself; who sneers at holiness, and who scoffs at truth. It is in his school chapel that a boy best learns that lesson in reverence—by precept and by example there he learns it. Adoration is the expression of man's highest reverence; the silence of the sanctuary, broken only that man may speak of God, or that man may speak to God; the prostrate forms of humble worshippers, the chants and psalms which lift up the heart above this earth; the penitential confession, which opens out through flashes of conviction the sight of God most Holy; above all, the mysterious awe which is rightly inseparable from the due celebration of the Holy Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood; these things day by day, seen and heard and felt, do bow and bend the soul before the High and Holy One, and cry, as with one voice, "O come, let us worship, and fall down, and kneel before the Lord our Maker." Nor does the voice die away when the act of

adoration is ended, it follows the boy-worshipper out into his school world, and moulds the actions of his daily life. And so it is that day by day, through the silent influence of chapel services, a boy who is true to himself learns that inward habit of reverence which will be his lasting safeguard against the unbelieving, vicious tendencies of this evil world into which he is being launched.

I say day by day, for I am one of those who lay great stress on daily matins and evensong as a help for masters and boys in their school life. I feel sure that the noblest characteristics of Englishmen come from the mass of Scripture they have heard since childhood at matins and evensong. Daily attendance in the school chapel not only brings the daily blessing of God upon the worshippers, but it becomes a most valuable instrument for teaching divinity, through the continuity of Scripture heard in the psalms and lessons of the day, reading the Bible through, and some parts through and through, every year.

Let me quote the writer of "Eton and the Empire." The newly-elected Member for Derby, in an address to the Eton Literary Society, speaking as a layman and public school man, says—"I cannot help emphasizing with all the force in my power the fact that we Etonians of my time should all of us have been much better men if we had taken more interest in the chapel services; at any rate," he says, "I speak for myself," and then he goes on to show why men should value the daily services of the Church and the Book of Common Prayer.

I know that masters may plead stress of work and school engagements as hindering frequent attendance at chapel services, but I venture to think otherwise; it would help, not hinder them, by giving them just what they need: refreshment, strength, power from on high, for the duties of their daily life. I have seen the hardest workers, the most frequent worshippers; I am old enough to remember the great Duke of Wellington, the Iron Duke, as men then called him, riding down day by day from Apsley House to Whitehall Place to attend the daily service at the Chapel Royal; and I have seen that great Statesman and Churchman, when for the fourth time he was Prime Minister of England, with all the cares of this great Empire on him, attending matins in Hawarden Parish Church day by day throughout the week.

No, in these things where there is a will there is a way; and the old saying is true—Prayer and provender hinder no man. Time fails me, or I could add much more on this, to me, most interesting subject; enough to add that I have been feebly tracing the lines laid down for religious teaching by the great founder of S. Nicolas College, the late Canon Woodard. He did his best to solve the question which is now before us, and in his foundation of S. Nicolas College we have the Church's National Society for Secondary Education, which is endeavouring to extend as far as possible down the social scale the highest possible form of training for soul and body that a youth can have, namely, that which is given in great public boarding schools, conducted on the lines of our old foundations, and in the principles of our historic Church—schools in which the leading characteristics are plain living, high thinking, manly bearing, and, above all, religious teaching; new schools on the old foundations, but with those foundations more deeply laid, more firmly placed; built on the rock of Christ's most

holy faith, entrusted to the keeping of Christ's own Catholic Church —schools of the Church, for which we want no endowments for man to covet, no aid from the State, no grant from any rate; that so, though poor, we may be free, free and unfettered to teach God's truth, no man forbidding us. And the visitor of our society, the bishop of the diocese in which the central school of each division may be placed, must see that we do so. We ask Churchmen, and Churchmen only, to help to build our walls, but not to daub them with untempered mortar, and when built, we will do our best to man them, fill them, hold, defend, and keep them safe, as far as any property in these days can be safe, from secularization, spoliation, and the kindred dangers of our age; and train within them, God helping us, generation after generation of true-hearted young Englishmen, ready and willing to do their duty to God and man, as sound Churchmen and good citizens, with all their heart, and with all their mind, and with all their soul, and with all their strength in whatsoever state of life it shall please Almighty God in His Providence to place them.

The Rev. the Hon. EDWARD LYTTELTON, Headmaster of Haileybury; and Hon. Canon of S. Albans.

As some of the remarks I wish to make are less militant in tone than the circumstances of the case may seem to some of my audience to require, I wish to say first that I deeply sympathize with those who feel some anxiety at the present time. Nothing, in my opinion, can exceed the importance of the duty which is laid upon us of making the education of our Secondary schools thoroughly and definitely Christian. First, we have no reason to suppose that God's revelation can be spread except by being taught, and we cannot countenance the theory that if you simply bring up a child to think clearly he will find out Christianity for himself; so that unless we teach the Gospel with all possible diligence we are disobedient to our Master. Secondly, we are convinced that a training in morals which is not based on, and interwoven with religion, is foredoomed to disastrous failure. Thirdly, undenominational religious education does not exist. No master can give a single lesson in the Bible which is not in harmony with the beliefs of some sect or section or denomination of the community. It is just as easy to be rigidly denominational by omitting certain truths as by insisting on them, for the simple reason that the creed of many English Christians is full of omissions; and the contention that this particular form of sectarianism is entitled to State support when all others are to be barred, is one which it is totally impossible to reconcile with elementary justice or common sense. I make these observations to show how thoroughly I agree with the main idea which has prompted this discussion.

There are, however, certain considerations to be borne in mind before we commit ourselves to any precipitate action. We are apt to go much astray in this question unless we remember that when legislation is impending, that which will be affected will be the educational machinery, not the educational spirit. I mean that in any given school, religious education must depend very largely indeed on the strength of the convictions of the teacher, and the atmosphere which is created thereby. Compared with this, machinery is unimportant. It cannot,

of course, create convictions and sincerity in the schoolmasters, and I think we may go so far as to say that if those convictions exist it is powerless to suppress them. I doubt if fifty Cowper-Temple Clauses could prevent a religious master from teaching the meaning of the Incarnation, or from showing his belief in the Church. You may depend upon it that the kind of religious teaching given is much less affected by statute than people think. The teacher's own inclinations determine the matter. If he is inclined to be colourless, he will point to the conscience clause or to the scheme of the Charity Commissioners, and say that he is forbidden to teach dogma; or if he is in a school without such restrictions, he will maintain that doctrinal teaching is bad for boys; but what really settles the question for him is his own belief, and the idea he has formed of God's revelation to the world. Therefore, I would insist on it with all emphasis, that if we Church people want real religious teaching in our schools, we must see that our homes turn out religious boys and girls who are to undertake the teaching of the next generation. And this is not merely a matter of building and maintaining Church Training Colleges, though that is important enough: it is a spiritual want, and I trust we all know that such a want can only be supplied by the action of the Holy Spirit. It is not even enough to get orthodox teachers—some of the worst religious teaching ever given has been given by such men; and, indeed, so many are the difficulties in our path before we arrive at the wished for goal, that we ought, I feel sure, to recognize in them a call to earnest and constant intercessory prayer. I do not urge these considerations in order to discourage effort, but to suggest that unless our zeal is spiritual as well as political, we shall do very little good indeed.

Having said so much, let me indicate to what points our political vigilance should be directed. The idea still prevails among some of our progressive friends that any receipt of public funds ought to be accompanied by a prohibition against using the formularies of our Church. Now, although it be true that under certain conditions the religious teaching may be very good in spite of this restrictive clause, yet such a disability is in point of fact not only unjust, but exceedingly silly, and must be resisted, without unnecessary alarm or outcry, but with all due determination. There are two facts in the recent past which will be used against us, and which we must be prepared to hear mentioned. The one is the withdrawal of Government grants from King's College, London, on the ground of the denominational character of the college; the other the clause in the Welsh Intermediate Education Act prohibiting the use of formularies to schools in receipt of public money. It should be noticed that this last disability was not recommended by the Schools Enquiry Commission of 1869, nor is it insisted on by the Charity Commissioners in their working of the Endowed Schools Acts, which are founded upon the recommendations of that Commission. It was the outcome of the weary debates in the House of Commons in 1870; and there is nothing in the nature of the case to make any such restriction necessary. We must take the greatest care to see that neither by the State nor by any local authority is such a provision attached to the distribution of public money. The practical effect of it would be to give an excuse to the manager of any public school for watering down the religious teaching to a filmy minimum;

and besides this we believe in our formularies. We have tried them and not found them wanting; and whether from an educational point of view we are right or wrong, it would be an injustice to forbid us the use of them. Lastly, such a prohibition stamps a school with a certain character in the eyes of the public, and you will never get men of strong religious convictions to support such schools, but rather to try and set up rival establishments where the teaching shall be unfettered. Hence a deplorable waste of money. What we really want is to give the stimulus of public subsidies to schools thoroughly denominational in tone, so that the enthusiastic support of members of each denomination may be evoked as widely as possible. It is perfectly easy to devise safeguards on behalf of the children of other denominations in all day schools, and many excellent suggestions to this effect have been made during the last few years. If the self-sacrificing support of various sections of the community is discouraged by the prohibitive action of the State, there will be a loss to all concerned—parents, children, and the country at large. The safeguards I speak of will respect first the wishes of parents, and secondly the opinions of the teachers. It is perfectly possible to reconcile the one with the other.

Now a word in conclusion with respect to our duties as citizens, not only as Churchmen. It is plain that the management of our Secondary schools is going to be put into the hands of local bodies. Let Church people all over the country get on to those local bodies, not primarily in order to push Church interests, but to do their utmost to enrich their Church feeling with a zeal for a rational education, and if they do this, Church interests will not suffer. Is it not certain that Secondary day schools depend for their support largely on the sympathy of the locality? Now, if that sympathy is given irrespective of religious education, and so as to allow managers to curtail it, or to abolish it altogether, the responsibility rests on the Churchpeople of the neighbourhood. They ought to prevent any such thing by being well represented on the local body, and also by quietly and firmly insisting that good secular instruction need not be bought by starving the children's souls. And in the name of all common-sense and prudence, do not fight against some representation of ratepayers on the Governing Bodies of the Secondary schools. Are not we ratepayers ourselves? Many of us in ordinary life are vividly conscious of the fact, but we forget it when we go on to a platform and talk about education. If all ratepayers, whether Churchmen or not, can only sit side by side and do their best to raise the idea of education among the middle classes of the country, there is positively no reason why the religious training need suffer. In various places we shall need a good deal of tact and pertinacity, especially where the neighbourhood enjoys the benefit of a restless newspaper editor, or of an over-anxious and bellicose incumbent. But the main thing will be secured if you remember that the religious tone of a Secondary day school depends in the long run on the influence of the parents, and that influence is yours to exercise.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. F. W. TRACY, Headmaster of South Eastern College, Ramsgate.

I DESIRE to press upon this meeting of the Congress of our Church one chief thought upon this question of religious education. That chief thought is, that the preservation of religious education in the future must mainly depend upon the nature of the religious training of our boys in the present.

We are all here agreed that religious education is not a mere branch of school teaching. But outside this meeting and outside our Church—and to some extent nominally within it—there are those who avowedly or practically hold that it is a mere branch. And they would set it more or less on a level with the various studies which are usually termed branches of education. It is no branch—it is the stem, the trunk, the root and the sap. Indeed, it is the very life, the only true life of a healthy education.

And now, as to its preservation. We are learning thoroughly—God be thanked—that the truest force in Church defence is Church progress. Similarly the truest force in the preservation of religious education within this our Church is progress.

We must admit, and when I say *we* I mean both parents and schoolmasters, if we face facts honestly, we must admit with sorrow that a great deal more might be done in the direction of progress than is at present being accomplished.

To put it shortly, I urge that the preservation of religious education in the future as a real factor in the life of our nation depends upon the personal acceptance of Christ as King by the heart of each individual boy in our public schools to-day. A high ideal this, but can the ideal be too high?

And what does this imply, if put to the touch of practice? Eloquently and truly were we told yesterday that in home mission work "the winning of the masses" was a misleading term, and that the essential condition and true aim must be the winning of the individual. Now this is readily admitted with regard to adults, but unfortunately it is very grudgingly granted in respect of the young.

People are "afraid of overdosing boys with religion." Why, so is every rational Christian. But catch phrases of that sort are often used to the detriment of work which would be effective for good if not thus impeded.

Again, we are very much afraid—perhaps we English people are rather too much afraid—of anything which arouses emotion. Certainly emotion is neither to be rashly accepted nor viewed as more than one of the factors in the awakening of a soul to life, or as a sign that that awakening is in course; distinctly not as a final proof of work completed. Emotion is not conversion; but emotion must often accompany awakening.

What, then, are we to indicate by this word conversion? Some people expect that there is always to be fixed, literally and exactly, a day, or even an hour, when there enters into the life of a boy something which completely changes and renews his whole spiritual nature. This truly may occur; it does at times occur. But it is not the invariable rule. Again some take the opposite contention, and say that everything of that sort is absolutely delusive, shallow, and untrue. This again is a fallacy.

Surely it is the truth that the Holy Spirit of God works with varying operation.

Sometimes, over the dim breadths of a desolate shore, a quiet tide uprises very calm, very gradual, almost imperceptible in its advance. Yet at length there has come upon that scene life and colour; it has been interpenetrated, it has been filled, it has been changed, we scarce know how. Yet again, does not that very tide elsewhere sweep on with a mighty wave, bursting barriers, overthrowing obstacles, and occupying all the ground with its strenuous life at a single onset?

And is not each in its sort an image of the truth, a shadowing of the action of the Holy Spirit of God upon the soul?

Let us not be afraid of facing the fact that a schoolboy is sometimes called to Christ suddenly and wholly; but let us not forget that with many conversion is gradual, and so gentle that it is difficult to distinguish one day from another. None the less is there true change in due season.

But the point is that the conversion of the schoolboy heart to Christ is a possibility and a fact. Another fact is, and of this fact we need to be ashamed, that the winning of the young heart to Christ is not being helped forward so much as it should be, nor is it being sufficiently recognized as the chief aim and central object of religious education.

There can be no truth in a religious education—I emphatically say *no* truth—if it has any lower ideal than this. Let our ideal be the upraising of a generation of sound, firm members of our Church, equipped with knowledge of her principles, and touched with devotion to her service; but more than all this, let the inspiration and the living force be that of young hearts loyally given to the One Lord and Saviour.

A fact within the experience of many of us is the working of the Holy Spirit upon a life which we had watched with sorrowing anxiety; a young life sinking, sinking into the darkest depths, without light, without hope of recovery. A fact it is that the uplifting, the penetrating, the overmastering power of the Spirit of God has brought real life and light, and made that perishing soul a strength for righteousness.

We admit such facts for one boy, or for a few. But in practice we appear afraid lest there be too many such. One hears it said, "If you had a school full of saints, a strange school that would be! It all depends what you mean by "saints." If you mean a school of sanctimonious hypocrites, deceiving and being deceived—may God deliver us from such a school. But if you mean a school full of sinners, consciously fighting against sin, in the strength of one recognized Lord and King, God give us many such schools as that.

It is quite true that headmasters are somewhat divided in opinion upon this matter. I strongly support the contention of a previous speaker that special helpers are needed. What headmaster worthy of his position would oppose any hindrance to the spiritual benefit which his boys would derive from the influence of an earnest chaplain? What ground could there be for fearing any friction between himself and that special helper, provided of course that their relative positions were clearly defined at the outset?

Let us indeed welcome all the help we can obtain—it cannot be too much.

It is the fact that several means of help which we at present have need careful watching. Watched they should be, both that their effects may be fully utilized and their opportunities enlarged, and watched also that they may be cautiously and wisely guided. Of these is the Schoolboys' Scripture Union. It has done and is doing a work conferring very great blessings.

The University Camps for Public Schools is an experiment which is full of hope, and promises to do a work of incalculable importance. It, however, calls for watchfulness and the greatest pastoral care on the part of the masters, to whom the boys return under the influences that have been brought to bear upon them.

But it is to our shame that these adventitious aids should be so needed.

And in this connection I must remark that it is a serious matter that the question of clerical masters has recently been raised in the spirit in which we have seen it discussed. In many cases—I do not say in all—but in many cases, it must surely be true that if a man sets first that which should be first, the training up of his boys to be soldiers and servants of Christ, he need not shrink from ordination.

Surely there ought to be nothing to prevent his binding himself in the strongest ties

and by the most sacred vows, as an ordained member of our Church, to the furtherance of those objects which are so close to the heart of her Lord.

It is no slur upon laymen workers for Christ to declare that many of them ought to offer themselves for ordination. Some, doubtless, are deterred by the fact that in older days ordination upon a school title was apt to be regarded as a mere formality. Some, doubtless, can more effectually work as laymen. However, I would not diverge into detail. Let me conclude by reiterating this one principle, that religious education, if it is to live as a force in the world, must be an education having true life in it. One vital force of education is stimulus. What stimulus is there for all highest purpose like that of a soul devoted to the service of God, and pledged thereby to the best use of all its powers? If religious education is to be preserved amongst us, it must be preserved by those who treasure as its central truth the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the heart, and the pledge and security of its continuance in the days to come must be the personal recognition of the claims of Jesus Christ by the individual schoolboy of to-day.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. THOMAS FIELD, Headmaster of the King's School, Canterbury.

MY words will be of a different character to those which we have heard. I rise to speak on behalf of the oldest Church schools, and, in some respects, the least regarded Church schools in the country—those attached to our cathedral churches. Some forty years ago, Mr. Whiston, of Rochester, declared that there were only two cathedral bodies which did not misappropriate the revenues and mismanage the affairs of the schools committed to their trust. That may be so or not, and I do not wish to touch upon the action of the cathedral bodies now. I merely wish to show that if in the past these schools have been regarded as the children of the Church, they have been regarded rather as step-children. I am reminded of this by the recent death of Mr. Whiston. To-day I merely wish to point to the fact that in the list of schools definitely claimed by the Church of England in the "Official Year Book," there is no mention of the cathedral schools at all. Again, at the Church Congress, in the official programme these schools find no place; and yet I think they have possibilities beyond those possessed by ordinary schools. These schools receive their revenues from the Church, they are entirely governed by ministers of the Church, and they are the only schools which completely fulfil the conditions alluded to in a remark made by Mr. Lyttelton, inasmuch as they are absolutely and entirely public schools, and are yet, by the Act of 1869, certified as belonging to the Church of England. It stands to reason that they must have greater opportunities than other schools. The progress of legislation on religious education in Wales shows that it is necessary for the Church to claim openly as her own any schools which are to be retained as Church schools under any future legislation. On that point it seems to be unwise that due recognition should not be extended to these particular schools. In addition to the advantages I have mentioned, they have another advantage. I do not make this remark in any invidious sense. It is very difficult to get a definite Church school which is not a party school. Some schools are avowedly so. A Church school is not likely to be founded now, unless by people who are enthusiastic, and those who are enthusiastic are not likely to be colourless. Therefore, in proportion as schools are well worked, and worked with enthusiasm, they are sure to be directed in a path which does not correspond to the full life of the Church, but only with a part of it. We, who are attached to these cathedral churches, know that we have something behind us far wider and more extensive than it is possible for schools carried on in this way to possess. We have that which must always make our teaching as broad and as general as the Church itself. These schools must always be the schools, not of one part of the Church, but of the Church altogether. There was a remark made by Canon Meynell which I should like to comment upon. He said there was an anxiety that there should be instruction in Church history—and in some places you may teach it; but in Canterbury we breathe it. Mr. Lyttelton also said something as to atmosphere, and it is the atmosphere of the cathedral church which colours the associations of these

schools, and puts them in a position of advantage which no modern school can possibly lay claim to. To take one instance from this very study of Church history: it has always been our contention that the Church of England was not founded at the Reformation. May I point out that one of my predecessors was the headmaster from the time before the Reformation up to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and this is an illustration to show how continuous the life of the Church was during that period. In regard to Church education, there is much discussion as to what is the right line to take, and the proper line, and the best scheme to be adopted, but we have in these schools something more than schemes. I was sent to this school, having been brought up in the bitterest Nonconformist sect. I was told when I went to this school that all sorts of things were taught there which were soul-destroying, and I have the recollection of how gradually the ideas conveyed to me melted away in this atmosphere of the Church, and how they have been changed, not only into devoted attachment to the place, but to the Church of which it is the mother. I believe that influence can be exercised by these places such as cannot be exercised by any schools which are of more modern foundation, and it is for that reason I have felt some indignation that Churchmen take up the discussion of religious education, and there is never the slightest mention of these institutions—nor are we mentioned in the official books. We are excluded from any place in the scheme of Church education, and it is for that reason I have made a protest which I hope is not intemperate, and have put before you the considerations which I hope will not be disregarded. In speaking in this manner, I would not depreciate at all the help my own school has received in regard to general work. It has received as much recognition as it is entitled to. What I claim is, that it should be placed in a definite scheme of religious work. The school must touch and be in contact with the great currents of public opinion, and it seems to me in the great and widespread interest which has been evoked by this question of religious education, that cathedral schools, which are remarkable in that respect, have had no part, and in all the vast sums devoted towards religious education they have had no share. I do think that if these schools are allowed to lapse now, an opportunity will be lost which will never recur; and I thought it my duty, as representing that which is the oldest school in the country, to put before you the claims of these cathedral schools; and I am obliged to you for having so heartily received my remarks.

The Rev. C. W. A. BROOKE, Secretary of the League for the Protection of Church Teaching in Secondary Schools, Victoria College, Stroud Green.

WE want to make this a practical meeting to-day, and there is a particular work in which every one of you can assist in reference to religious education in Secondary schools, which for the moment has nothing to foster and to guide it. The pious children of the Church have in the past founded schools, but she has not done anything practical for securing religious education up to the present time. But there is a new method going to be started by the League for the Protection of Church Teaching in Secondary Schools, and we want the help of every individual who feels the importance of this subject. What, then, can Churchpeople do to influence the bulk of private and endowed schools throughout the country? A great scheme has been started in the diocese of Oxford in furtherance of this object. The Bishop of Oxford has sent a private letter to every head of a school above the elementary class in his diocese. He has collected through the archdeacons, rural deans, and incumbents, a list of every school of six pupils and over. There are three great things we want to do. In regard to diocesan examinations for Middle Class schools, we do not want to depend on a new examination, because teachers are overdone with examinations, but there is something at our very hand which we want to alter. The Oxford and Cambridge Joint Board's examinations, the Oxford and Cambridge local examinations, and the local examinations of the College of Preceptors, might, we think, be amended, and we propose to urge that there shall be added optional papers in Church history and Church teaching. These examinations extend to some thirty thousand children every year, and at the present time definite Church teaching is not a subject which can be taken up by a candidate. What attitude, then, do the Oxford and Cambridge syndicates take up? Individual members of them write and say that we must take the initiative, and get teachers, clergy, and parents, to send up petitions in favour of the change of regulations,

as they only want us to give them reasons for such an alteration. In regard to the College of Preceptors, I know there may have to be a tremendous fight. We wish these bodies to give us Churchpeople the privilege of seeing that our children are founded in the faith and doctrines of the Church. When the regulations are altered, we hope to find those who throughout the whole of England, in every diocese, will offer prizes, so that different schools shall be urged to take up these optional subjects, and to try one against the other to see which can take the bishop's or other prize offered. That will give them something to aim at. In a certain diocese in the Midland Counties at one local examination two hundred children were examined, and not a single one of those took up the mere modicum of Church teaching which is now optional, viz.: that referring to the Church Catechism; but in the case of candidates coming from a neighbouring diocese, every single child took up that subject. The reason is not far to seek; there was a Church Catechism prize offered in the latter town, and this all the children aimed at gaining. When the regulations are altered, there will be no difficulty, we think, in getting the prizes offered. Then as to the tabulated statement in regard to schools, to which I have already referred, we hope to get every bishop, or if we do not, the League must do the work, to issue a list of schools in their diocese which will undertake to give Church teaching by Church teachers to the children of Church parents who claim it. At the present time, I think we clergy ought to speak out a great deal more strongly than we do speak from the pulpit, and tell parents that whenever they enter a child at a school it is their bounden duty to find out what religion he or she is going to be brought up in. The parents in reply to such advice very often say, "I do not know, I cannot judge between the schools; at this school it is said there is religious teaching, and I cannot judge." But we hope to get these diocesan lists of schools, and to have schools started where Church education can be obtained. A school may have a dissenter at the head of it, but that does not matter so long as the headmaster will give an assurance that there shall be efficient and sufficient Church teachers prepared to give Church teaching to such children of Church parents as claim it. When this is done, at any rate the laity cannot say that we have left them without any guidance. As I said, we desire to accomplish three things; (1) A diocesan list of schools where Church teaching can be obtained; (2) the alteration of the Oxford and Cambridge and College of Preceptors local examinations; and (3) when this is done the founding of diocesan prizes for Church history and doctrine. I do hope that everyone here will take an immense interest in this subject. We shall have a meeting at ten o'clock on Saturday, which I hope all who can will attend. If you cannot attend it, if you will send six stamps, you will have a printed report of the meeting sent to you as soon as it is out, because we shall want the help of everyone of you. We have an enormous difficulty in finding out persons who will sign these petitions to the syndicates of Oxford and Cambridge, and to the College of Preceptors. At the end of this month ten thousand circulars are going to be sent out at an expense of £50, simply to find out who are the Church teachers available, in order to aid us in dealing with this subject. When we have done our work, we propose lodging one list of Church Middle Class teachers at the Church House, in case it could be of use within the next ten years. The difficulty is mainly through the fact that Secondary Education is entirely unorganized.

The Rev. SPENCER JONES, Rector of Batsford with Moreton-in-Marsh, Gloucestershire.

THERE is one word which I wish to say in connection with this subject, and that is the word "Catechism;" and I wish to say it as supplementing what has been said, and not with a view of pretending that I have anything new to advance. I would remind you of two texts which are very often in my mind. S. John says: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." That strikes me always as being a grand text of education; and I think it is such a pity that we do not sometimes preach sermons on texts of that kind, without saying that they are going to be sermons on education. The other text is from S. Paul, who says: "Until we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." It seems to me that one great truth emerges from these texts, and that is the sacramental truth touched upon by one of the Readers of the papers, that our Lord was

in the world reconciling man unto God, and that He sent His Apostles to stand in His place, and therefore, also, all teachers who are associated with those who are the successors of the Apostles. Moreover, they show that the whole work of education, whether you call it secular or religious, is really one thing, and that the two aspects of it should not be separated. We find, however, that they are treated as diverse in the speeches of men who are good Churchmen; and one of our leading statesmen, in connection with the opening of an educational establishment, said, "Education is a very good thing, but there is something else besides." What do you think that something else was? It was religion. But we, I think, want to show that religion is an integral part of education, and if we can preach this on Sunday, we shall no longer have diverse views between secular teachers and those who are teaching religion. At present, in many cases there is one process in regard to education going on during the week, and there is another process which goes on beside this on Sunday. There does not seem to be any connection between the two at all. A great deal has been said about the method of S. Sulpice in regard to the teaching of the Catechism, and under that system we have in some of our parishes been able to make some progress in the work. A description of the system has been committed to print by its teachers, and the point is, how can we use that method in regard to teaching the Church Catechism. First of all, consider the importance of bringing our Church Catechism into our churches; and, according to the system of S. Sulpice, in order to make the Catechism a living reality, we must make it a living situation. As soon as you teach the child the questions and answers, you find you have to explain the answers, and then the child has to be taught to analyze the meanings. Thus, the first consideration is, whether the child knows the answer to the question; then, does he understand the answer; and then when, after explanation, he does, there will be the exercise or homily. The great point is, whether the child loves these teachings in his or her heart, and in order to bring the Catechism home to the children you must bring it into the Church, making it into a living situation. You have within the Church Catechism the whole of the teaching which you have to give to the children; and with a regular course of three years for the three stages of instruction, the children are, according to this method, thoroughly instructed. This being so, people outside the diocese or parish in which this method is pursued will speedily find out the state of things. The definite teaching you are giving in your church will find its way through these children into the school they attend; and after a time teachers will come and say, "I wish you would let us know what course you are taking as to instruction, because we may just as well teach it in our school." In this way you are gradually exercising an influence upon the teaching in schools, as well as upon the children you instruct. I feel quite certain that few people who have no experience have any idea of what effect that will have in the homes of the poor, and if this is effective in the case of the poor, why should it not be the same in the case of children of richer parents. It is for this reason I ask you to pay attention to the system of S. Sulpice, and see how it can be brought to bear upon our Church Catechism. We parochial clergy should, I think, have the Catechism in the parish church every Sunday, and it will have an influence on the parents at home, and also help to bind us with some of the teachers in our higher schools as well. One further thought comes into my mind. Why should we not in parishes where there are small Middle Class schools offer ourselves to the headmaster or headmistress, and say, "If I can be of any use in the instruction of the children in all religious matters, use me. I don't want any pay, but use me." I think the teachers and parents would welcome such a course.

The Ven. D. R. THOMAS, Archdeacon of Montgomery; and Canon of S. Asaph.

I FEEL I ought to apologise to the meeting in descending from the high tone which has marked the discussion so far, but if I read the subject to be discussed, I find it is the Preservation of Religious Education in the Secondary and Higher Schools and Colleges, and I wish to refer more especially to one danger to that preservation which has already been casually alluded to, namely, the legislation which has already taken place in this direction for Wales. Mr. Lyttelton in his address said the teaching depended upon the spirit of the teacher, and not upon legislation. To a certain extent that, of course, is quite true, but at the same time it will be acknowledged that legislation may very materially affect the character of the religious teaching. The Intermediate Education Act (Wales), 1882, has put under the influence of a new system, not only the schools which that Act gives powers to bring into existence, but

to a great extent many of our old foundations, and it has come to pass that schools dedicated from their foundation, and continued to the present time as distinctly Church schools, have been laid hold of. The Act empowers the appointment by each County Council of an education committee composed of five members, three appointed by the County Council and two by the Government. They have to draw up the schemes, and in these schemes, so far as they have already been brought out, it is laid down that the religious opinions of the governors of the schools shall not be taken into consideration. It is also laid down that no distinctive religious catechism or formulary shall be taught in these schools. The Act itself quotes the Endowed Schools Act of 1869, and exempts from its operation two classes of schools; but when it comes to the interpretation of the section, we find a resolute attempt made to confiscate them. The schools exempted from its operation are cathedral schools, and those schools for which the founders, or the representatives of the founders, have within fifty years of their death laid down distinctly what kind of religious instruction shall be given. We thought that we were, with respect to a great many of our schools, safe; but when the Education Committees of the Counties of Denbighshire and Montgomeryshire drew up their schemes, one claimed the school at Ruthin, the other those of Berriew and Deytheur. Ruthin school was founded and endowed by Dean Goodman, who bought the rectorial tithes appropriated to an old priory, and set up the school for educational purposes in his native town. He drew up the religious forms and prayers which were to be observed in that school, and distinctly required that the school should be a Church school. That continued to be acted upon until after the passing of the Act of 1869. One would have thought that the provision of the Education Act which exempted such schools would have done so in this case, but it seems that during the interval between 1869 and the passing of the Intermediate Education Act a slight change had taken place in regard to the clause referring to religious instruction in that school. Instead of its being provided that the education should continue in accordance "with the principles of the Church of England," it was ordered by the Endowed School Commissioners to be in accordance with the "principles of the Christian faith." But though the governors of the school protested against the change and sent up a remonstrance to the Commissioners, it was ignored. When the County Education Committee for Denbighshire drew up their scheme they quietly claimed possession of the school, and it all but passed into their hands. A resolute opposition was, however, organized, the circumstances of the case were laid before the House of Lords, and the House of Lords, acting upon the equity of the case, rescued the school from the hands of the county committee. I mention this to show that the exact wording of an Act of Parliament should be examined. We must not accept the terms or the statements of those who advocate a Bill; we must only be content with the actual words embodied in the Act. The other two endowed schools are in my own archdeaconry. The one, Berriew, was endowed in 1652, during the Commonwealth period, but, curiously enough, the first trustees of that school were the deprived clergy of the parish and the adjoining parish. The school was conducted until the beginning of this century as a Church school; and about 1816 a Master in Chancery was sent down to examine into the particulars of the case, and after close examination on the spot a scheme was drawn up requiring that the school should be conducted according to the principles of the Established Church, and laying down that the Church catechism and liturgy were to be taught in the school. Under the new Act a scheme was put forward taking possession of this school, ignoring the fact that the scheme of the Master in Chancery laid down very distinctly the character of the religious instruction to be given in it. When the scheme was issued, twenty parishioners signed a petition asking that the scheme should be laid before the House of Commons. By some means or other twelve of the names of those who had petitioned were withdrawn, and then notice was sent down to say that as there were no longer sufficient signatures left, no further notice would be taken of the petition, and the scheme would be proceeded with as if no petition had been presented. Accordingly, it was pushed forward, and signed by the Queen in Council. But such a proceeding has been admitted by the legal advisers of the late Government to be unconstitutional; and it now remains to be seen what steps the present Government will take to rectify the wrong. The other endowed school—Deytheur—founded in 1684, required that the rules and regulations should "not be contrary to the customs and ecclesiastical canons of the Established Church then in force." And this requirement had been hitherto observed; but, because this was only a negative and not a positive requirement, by a legal quibble it has been put aside, and here, too, the new scheme is undenominational. Nothing seems to be safe, and no help is available for existing Church schools, unless they consent to barter their principles.

The Rev. ARTHUR PHILLIMORE, Rector of Enville, Stourbridge.

I WISH to shift the discussion for a short time from the point of view of the teacher to that of the parent. I believe there are two great powers which will help to preserve religious education in our schools and colleges. One is essentially the work of the Church, viz. :—the formation of a right public opinion ; and the other is the clear, outspoken demand of the parent for the "religious education" of his children. I want to specify what I know is in the minds of many parents when they send their boys to public schools. When a boy leaves his home for such a school, he is leaving the great educating influence of the mother. And let us always bear in mind that we do not wish to confuse "Church teaching" with "Religious Education." They are two different things. The one may indeed be included in the other, because there cannot be true Christian "religious education" without "Church teaching"; but the religious education of the boy is a larger field than his Church teaching. And when a boy leaves home the battle-field of life is enlarged. He has also to change the sphere of education, because he has left the great school of home-life in which his character has been forming. So that when a boy changes home for school, what we have a right to expect the master of that school to do is, that he shall "Godfather" the boy. We make this demand without in any way wishing to evade the parental responsibility. The mother's prayers will follow the boy, and letters may be exchanged between the lad and his father ; but for three-quarters of the year it is the schoolmaster who has that lad under his power and influence. The lad has not only to learn dogma, but he has to acquire self-control, and to learn how to consecrate the whole of his nature and all his affections, which are so near the surface, and which are so easily touched. We put our boy into the hands of the schoolmaster, and we have the right to ask that the "religious education" of that lad shall be seen to. I should say that in doing this we ask three things. First, that his life of worship shall be fostered, not smothered ; and I believe that a lad's worship is a very pure and very beautiful thing. Now at school, his life of worship may be developed, or, I will not say destroyed (God forbid that it should be so !), but smothered. The necessity of a beautiful chapel has been rightly insisted upon by the Reader of one of the papers to-day, and such a thing is a very great advantage. Then the lad should have every facility for his own Bible reading. I am glad to think this is very generally attended to now. We have altered for the better the state of things which used to prevail. We used to hear of the boy who was "slippered" because he said his prayers. Now we hear of the boy who, on going to bed without saying his prayers, was pulled out of bed by the other boys and made to say them. In the next place, we ask in regard to "religious instruction," that it may be given, not as a divinity lecture, but as the feeding of Christ's lambs ; given in a loving spirit, in an earnest way, heart to heart, and soul to soul, so that the lad may assimilate it, and make it a real factor and power in his life. But now I come to another point, and that is, that what the lad wants above all, will be personal help and the continuance of that "education" of his moral character which he has previously had, or, at any rate, ought to have had, at home. I believe that the "crisis" of many lives is during the school-life. I have known young men go up to the Universities, of whom, I should say, speaking humanly, that the character has either been made or marred in the school-life, and we cannot be content to think that any young fellow can go up to Oxford or Cambridge with his character already stamped for evil. We cannot believe in predestination to evil, and there must have been something wrong—some weak link in the chain which has given way—if a boy has gone through school life, and when he is eighteen years of age shows a character which is low and degraded. Undoubtedly the boy at school does want a hand which will help him, and an ear into which he can speak in confidence, and a voice which will guide him. I do not know what may be the plans proposed by the headmasters to meet this difficulty, but it has not yet been grappled with in all our great schools. The school chaplain has been proposed for such a post by one speaker to-day, and I dare say it is the best solution ; but it is not for me to say how the difficulty can be met. I only speak of the demand which we who are parents make, and I think we have a right to make it. When the boy leaves the home and goes into the fire of the temptations of our great public schools, that boy wants someone who will be a help to him, and will assist in modelling his character, drawing out what is best in him, and correcting and controlling that which is faulty. It is absurd to think that the boy will grow up unassisted, and yet possess the virtues of discipline and self-control. We have had to learn these things, and it is our duty to teach them to our lads and see that they are

taught. In conclusion, then, I venture to say that we parents must ask for these three things: first, that the life of worship be attended to and fostered; secondly, that clear and definite religious instruction be given in an earnest and sympathetic way; and thirdly, that there shall be some personal influence, some guidance of the lad, in order to make the best man that it is possible to make out of him.

The Ven. Wm. Emery, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely; Permanent Secretary to the Church Congress.

I was anxious to take a small part in the discussion this afternoon, because I greatly fear that unless Churchpeople awake, they will find that after all their great exertions to preserve definite religious education in primary schools, there will be established in the country a large system of Secondary Education on an undenominational basis. The Archdeacon of Montgomery has referred to the Intermediate Education Act for Wales. When it was passed, I protested against it at one of the Welsh Congresses, and stated my belief that it would lead to undenominational schools in Wales. I was taken to task by a Conservative member of Parliament, who had much to do with the passing of the Act, but the result has been pretty much what I predicted it would be. The conclusion I have come to is this—not to put too much faith in those in authority, to whatever political party they belong, but to watch carefully the measures introduced, and see that they are what we ourselves approve. Secondary Education in England has no doubt not received that attention which it should have done. We have our great public schools, but as far as I have been able to hear this afternoon, a very important part of the child community have not been mentioned, namely—girls. Yet this is a very important part of society, and we ought to give very great attention to the education of girls. I happen to be the chairman of the Church Schools Company, which has now been instituted fourteen years. We have established twenty-seven schools from Kendal to Brighton, most of them for girls. They are principally day schools, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York as patrons. Our principle of religious education was agreed to by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the first instance. It is that the education should be a religious education, the schools to give definite Church teaching, the right of withdrawing a scholar in the day schools from such religious instruction being reserved to the parent or guardian. I may just say in passing that, although we have two thousand five hundred children in our schools, and a number of them are children of Nonconformists, scarcely any have been withdrawn. But what I fear is, that if we do not take care, we shall lose the benefit of such schools. You know there has been a Commission on Secondary Education, the report of which will soon be out, upon which I suppose legislation will be founded. If we do not take care, I fear we shall find ourselves landed in very much the same difficulty as Wales has been. That I think will be a terrible misfortune, because I reason out the matter thus. If the children of the great middle class are educated in schools with a strictly undenominational education, it is impossible to suppose that when they come into a position of responsibility they will make any great effort to give definite religious instruction to the children of the poor. I feel this is very well worth considering, not only for the present, but for the future. I am not going to raise here a quarrel against another Company, but there is an influential Company which has been at work some years longer than the Church Schools Company has been, and which has lately by its secretary sent out a circular with respect to one of its schools opened close to one of ours, in which he states that the religious education given in the new school will be be "strictly undenominational." I do not know what strictly undenominational religious education is. As far as I can understand, Churchpeople do not want it for the children of the poor; and if so, then I say let them be very careful that they do not find themselves landed in a system of strictly undenominational education for the children of the middle class. I should like Churchpeople to arouse themselves, and try if they can, before any legislation takes place, to strengthen and increase those schools where definite religious education is given according to the doctrines and teachings of our Church of England. I am not in the secrets of the Commission, but it is just possible the report will suggest a due consideration for schools that are already existing, possibly pecuniary help on certain terms; also the formation of county educational boards, with power to supply Secondary schools where required in the different counties. I wish Churchmen to consider well what that means, and what it may lead to, and the term on which these local committees, when formed, are to be allowed to establish schools

And I wish them also to consider the warning of Wales, and to watch carefully the way in which the committees will be empowered to deal with old endowments of other schools, remembering what we have just heard of the attempt to get hold of the endowed school at Ruthin for an undenominational school, and the several Church endowments which have already been seized for like purpose. It is only now we are told that the present Government are determined that a certain school shall not have the particular terms of its endowment altered, and shall be allowed to preserve its property and its Church connection. I feel very deeply that there is a great crisis with respect to religious education in Secondary schools impending, and that if Churchmen turn their attention, as they do with the greatest enthusiasm, to give the children of the poor a definite religious education, they must not neglect the consideration of, in one sense, the education of a still more important part of the community, the great middle class of the country. Only one word with respect to our Cathedral schools. A good deal has been done of late years for many of these schools. Some years ago it was found that by a certain clause in an Act of Parliament the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were enabled, under certain conditions, to help Cathedral schools. Several Cathedral schools have been so assisted, among them those of Ely, Chester, and probably many others. Certainly these schools do try to give a religious education based on the doctrines and teachings of the Church of England, and I very much regret to hear that the valuable "Year Book of the Church of England" does not give due prominence to these schools. As I happen to be the chairman of the Christian Knowledge Committee, which deals with the subject, I will do my best to call attention to the matter.

ASSEMBLY ROOMS.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 9TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH in the Chair.

FAITH AND SCIENCE.

RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS PRESSING UPON THE RISING GENERATION CONNECTED WITH

(1) FIXITY OF DOGMA.

(2) PROGRESS OF SCIENCE.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

THE subject of our discussion this afternoon is one of the most important that can possibly be brought before us, and one upon which it is necessary to make use of the best knowledge that we possess. It is, to consider the relationship between that eternal revelation which God has given of Himself in Scripture, and that progressive revelation He is giving to men in science, which means the knowledge of the outer world which we see. It must be a subject of great importance to see how we can best use that knowledge. I now ask Bishop Barry to read the first paper.

The Right Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D., D.C.L., Canon of Windsor; and Rector of S. James', Piccadilly.

THE task assigned to us at this Session is not, if I understand it rightly, to deal with what are called "Christian evidences"—to give reasons,

that is, for belief in the reality of Christian truth in general. It bids us, first, to consider, not Christian truth in itself, but its exhibition as Christian dogma; next, to examine how far there is fixity in Christian dogma, through all ages, under the change of conditions brought about by the advance of human knowledge.

I.—The word "dogma" is so loosely used, that it is necessary to clear our minds by asking, first, "What is Christian dogma?" It is not merely an enunciation of Christian truth, but an authoritative proclamation of it with unhesitating certitude, as essential to the development of Christian life, and as a condition of Christian fellowship. Now such proclamation, as it seems to me, is plainly accordant with all true philosophy. No man can live his own life rightly without knowledge, implicit or explicit, of the laws of his being; no society of men can have unity of life and action without some common acknowledgment of these supreme laws. If the truth of Christ be what it certainly claims to be—the ultimate truth of God, the truth of humanity, the truth of God and man made one—it is impossible for humanity to grow into the full spiritual life without some grasp of this truth by faith, and to have religious unity without acknowledgment of it as the guiding principle of common life. Advancing science should enable us better than ever to understand the declaration that "the Light is the life of men."

But certainly this acceptance of Christian dogma is simply an acceptance of the conditions of the actual advent of Christianity in the world on the Day of Pentecost, on the revelation by the Spirit of God of the truth of Christ, as a means, through the acceptance of faith, both of individual regeneration and of the birth of a Catholic Church. Certainly, through all the centuries it has been the law of the expansion of that Church. Creeds, which are the acceptance of that proclamation, are as old as Christian baptism itself. It could not be otherwise. Whatever may be the case with other religions, Christianity cannot consent to rest on a common glow of sentiment, or even on acceptance of a common morality. For our Lord Himself said, "For this cause was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness of the Truth." In His great declaration He made "I am the Truth" the central conception, through which He was at once "The Way" and "The Life."

We know, of course, only too well that the simple acceptance of Christian truth by the mind is not vital Christianity—that the true "knowledge of God, which is life eternal," needs the adhesion of the heart and spirit—nay, that mere head-knowledge only "puffs up; it is love that builds up." The true knowledge is the knowledge of the living God in the Lord Jesus Christ; and for such knowledge the light of truth and the grace of justification and sanctification must be harmonized together. It is easy enough, if indeed it is worth while, to show that mere dogmatic Christianity is a dead thing, and that ages of dogmatism may not be ages of a living faith.

We know, also, that there have been times in Church history, where there has been a scholastic exaggeration of Christian dogma, not free from artificiality and usurpation, and from condemnation in God's Name of those whom manifestly He has not condemned. Such exaggeration brings always the Nemesis of excessive resistance and reaction. It is to this scholasticism that the word "dogmatic" is

commonly applied; and so applied, it has naturally become a term of opprobrium, or a term of contempt.

But still the fact remains, that an undogmatic Christianity is practically a thing impossible, perhaps in the individual soul, certainly in any Church society. The teaching of history is here plain. When Christianity emerged from its long struggle to become the religion of the civilized world in the fourth century, it was, we remember, the first natural but superficial impression of Constantine, that on the great Arian question men might avoid dogmatic utterance, and agree to differ. But when he understood the point really at issue, he was statesman enough to see that this agreement was impossible, and that the one thing needful was to ascertain what the Christian truth really was. The result was the first great dogmatic creed of Nicæa, asserting without explaining mystery; and on this the Church rested without further question for more than twelve hundred years.

II.—If this be what is meant, or should be meant, by Christian dogma, it follows necessarily that it must have an essential fixity.

That fixity depends, first, on the unalterable fixity of fact. The Christian Creed—while it declares the Fatherhood of God and the Personal reality of the Divine Spirit—yet, as distinctively Christian, is the recital of stupendous fact—the initiation for humanity of a new supernatural life, which is to grow through the ages here, and to be perfected in a higher dispensation hereafter. To take the order of its actual proclamation to the world, it is, first, the declaration of the great visible miracle of miracles, the beginning of the new creation, in the actual Resurrection and Ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ; it is, next, the declaration, as evidenced by this exaltation of the Son of Man, of the fact that His death was and is the sacrifice of Atonement for the sin of the whole world; lastly, of the great invisible miracle of miracles, the incarnation of the Godhead in His true humanity in the cradle at Bethlehem. The whole of this Epiphany of the Son of God is to Christian faith not only fact, but the one determining fact of all future history—like (if natural things may be compared with supernatural) the fact of the introduction of life into the inanimate world, and of humanity into the animate creation. Clearly the witness to it cannot change, if it ever was a true witness. Either it is and was the greatest of delusions, the greatest of falsehoods, or it is an unchanged and unchangeable truth.

But this fixity of dogma, as will probably have been seen, rests on a second foundation—on the absolute truth and finality (that is) of the teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ. Of these three great fundamental facts of which I have spoken, the first—the fact of the Resurrection and Ascension—was a visible fact—testified to by eye-witnesses, who were as certain of it as of their own existence—testified to, I may add, by its result in the actual outpouring of the Holy Spirit, to be through faith the regeneration of themselves and of the world. But the reality of the other two great facts rests ultimately on the word of Christ, as "the word of eternal life." The death on the Cross of Calvary itself was a visible fact, before the eyes of the world, as well as the eyes of the disciples. But who can know, except from His own word—the germ of the whole Apostolic and Church teaching—that "His life was given as a redemption," "a ransom for the many," and that "His blood was shed

for the remission of sins"? The birth of the Child in the manger of Bethlehem was again a visible fact, heralded by angelic song to the shepherds, as the representatives of simple humanity. But who can tell its inestimable meaning, except from the declaration, typical of so many which fell from His own lips, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world?" "I and the Father are one." And, I may add, that on this same word we rest, not only for the great facts of the past, but for the reality of the divine facts of the present and the future—His sitting now at the right hand of God, to complete His mediatorial work, and His coming again to Judgment, when that work is done.

It is this word of Christ Himself, which is the central life of all revelation, as His manifestation is the central determining fact of all human history. All that goes before it in Holy Scripture has its sacredness and its truth, as preparatory to it; all that follows is simply the development of it in the various phases of Apostolic teaching. The words opening the Epistle to the Hebrews may be extended in both directions; and they are words, which it would be an impossible claim for even the greatest of mere sons of men. Through all others, who were prophetic messengers of the Lord, God spake in divers degrees and divers forms of imperfection: He hath spoken to us once and for ever in the Son, because He is the effulgence of His glory, and the express image of His person.

In both aspects it is clear that this essential fixity of Christian dogma is bound up indissolubly with our faith in a living Christ, as the manifestation of the Godhead in human flesh. No advance of human knowledge, disclosing to us either the facts of the history of the universe and of humanity in it, or the forces and laws by which it is ruled, can possibly affect it. If it is true at all, it is eternally true. But let those supreme facts be disbelieved, either as to their reality, or as to their transcendent meaning; let that teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ be looked upon as imperfect, and liable to error—as, indeed, less than Divine—then it seems to me that the very existence of Christian dogma, in the strict sense of the word, is unwarrantable, or that, if it exist at all, it can have no fixity, but must be held only provisionally, as liable to be superseded by something higher and deeper and more comprehensive than itself.

III.—But is there no sense in which Christian dogma is affected by the advance of human knowledge, historical, scientific, philosophical? Certainly, as to its form, its extent, and its secondary developments, it has varied greatly in the past: since knowledge now advances with increasing rapidity, it is likely to vary even more in the future.

This variability, as it seems to me, belongs necessarily to what we may call (to use the ordinary phraseology) the meeting-point of the Natural and the Supernatural;* accordingly, first, to the connection and correlation of these divine facts with the other facts and laws of the world's history, and, therefore, to their actual effects on the complex fabric of human life and human nature; and next, to the interpretation and right development of the word of Christ, in its corresponding

* I use this common phraseology without forgetting—what Butler pointed out long ago—that there is a unity in the whole disposition of God, and that the distinction of the Natural and Supernatural implies no separation between them, or implication of contrariety.

relation to all other forms of teaching. It will, therefore, be exhibited most strikingly at epochs of special advance of knowledge and intellectual activity; as, for instance, in the fourth and fifth centuries, when Christianity became the religion of the civilized world, and so was brought into relation with the institutions and the wisdom of men; in the sixteenth century, as the century of the Renaissance, which was (as its name implies) the new birth of modern literature and philosophy; in our own century, as the epoch of the marvellous development of physical and anthropological science, and of the emergence of great theories of evolution and unity of all the forces which rule the world.

In respect of this last development, with which we are practically concerned, we can hardly fail to recognize two important tendencies of modern thought, bearing the one upon the true idea, and the other upon the right scope, of Christian dogma.

First, in regard to its idea, the dominant conception of our day is the discovery and study of harmony, in the true sense of the word, between the Natural and the Supernatural—to a continued enlargement of the doctrine of Analogy. This tendency, which I believe to embody profound truth, must tell upon the form of Christian dogma. There have been times, when the essential distinctiveness of the supernatural, in fact and in word, has been so exclusively emphasized in Christian teaching, as to result in its isolation, if not in its discord, from all that is natural. These will be times of strong denunciatory enunciations of Christian dogma. There have been reactions against this teaching, which we call rationalistic, tending to obliterate the distinctiveness of the supernatural altogether; to question the Divine facts or turn them into symbol and allegory; to make Christian teaching differ only in degree from the wisdom of men; and inevitably to explain away the great mystery of mysteries in the Incarnation of the Son of God. These are times, which naturally depreciate the value, and shrink from any confident assertion, of Christian dogma. Our age is, I think, satisfied with neither of these opposing tendencies—seeing clearly that harmony, as it forbids discord, so involves something more than mere unison. Where it asserts dogma, it sees in the facts, to which it bears witness, the supernatural culmination of human history, in its doctrines the supernatural culmination of natural truths. Take a few instances of this tendency. No one can study the Christian teaching of the present day on the nature of miracle, its function in religious manifestation, its relation to the natural laws of God; on the principle of Mediation, its connection with unity and heredity in human-kind, its imperfect foreshadowings in the natural order, and its perfection in the supernatural; on the nature of Prophetic and Apostolic inspiration, its relation to the universal inspiration of human nature, and the special inspiration of the great leaders and teachers of humanity; on the relation of Christian grace, in the soul and in the Church, to the natural gifts, capacities, and corruptions of human nature, and the natural ties which bind together and animate human society—without seeing very clearly how important are its modifications, in the understanding and in the proclamation of the essential and unchangeable Christian truth.

Next, in regard to the scope of Christian dogma—as distinguished from Christian speculation and philosophy—it is clear that the tendency of our time is resolutely towards its simplification. We hold it true

wisdom to confine it to the declaration of the essential Christian mysteries themselves, excluding from it theories, however wise and authoritative, as to their explanation, their ground, their reconcilement with other known truths—to acknowledge them, in fact, to be in the true sense mysteries, revealed indeed in Christ, but yet not so revealed as to be known of man with the perfect knowledge which belongs only to God. The history of the Church, indeed, is full of alternations, of exaggerations of dogma and of reactions against them. In the age of the Councils, round the great mystery of the Incarnation, how many were the fierce controversies of dogmatic statement, as to its method and its explanation, its reconcilement with the supreme unity of God, the relations of the divine and human in the Person of Christ, the bearing of the Christian verity on the mystery of the Holy Trinity! How wise and happy the decision of the Councils, to be content with the simple assertion of the Divine Mystery itself, without explanations, which would ultimately explain it away, on one side or the other! In the great crisis, again, of the sixteenth century, when the yoke of the old scholasticism, explaining and defining and deducing everything, had been shaken off, how soon there arose a new scholasticism—of theories, of the methods of Justification and Sanctification, of the inscrutable relation of the predestination and election of God to the freewill and responsibility of man! How rife was that century of dogmatic Confessions, distinct, often antagonistic and denunciatory, imposed as conditions of communion on individuals and Churches! Yet how certainly, not by decree of Œcumenical Council, but by consent of Christendom, all these theories became obsolete, and the imposition of those Confessions which enforced them was removed or lightened! There remained simply the new emphasis on the great mystery of the Atonement, of the justification in the Blood of Christ, of the redeeming and regenerating power of His grace. But never, I think, was the tendency to simplification stronger than in our own day. Everywhere along all lines of thought this tendency shows itself, to the assertion of a few fundamental principles, rather than the framing of elaborate systems. So it is in that realm of high theology, which is the home of Christian dogma. The basis, which the Lambeth Conference of 1888 held to be broad enough and deep enough for Christian unity, was on its doctrinal side simply the acceptance of the Holy Scripture as the rule of faith, and of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds—the great creeds of the West and the East—as the summary of needful Christian dogma.

IV.—Such, as it seems to me, is our present position in respect of Christian dogma, in face of our advancing human knowledge. I would only suggest in conclusion that these last two considerations tend, not to impair, but rather to strengthen and establish, the fixity of its essential witness. For the first asserts it as the crown and perfection of the natural order, the reality and grandeur of which we learn more fully every day; the other, by wise critical insight, pierces through the secondary elements, which are necessarily uncertain and changeable, and brings out to us the essential reality, which alone lies below the surface-currents of change.

Never (it has been said) was there an age, which, in its wildest speculations and denials, was more irresistibly, if unconsciously, theological, refusing to be content with what used to arrogate to itself the name of

"positive knowledge," and insisting on some conception of the supreme reality, which underlies all mere phenomena. We, if we are Christians indeed, ought to rejoice in these feelings after an unknown God, certain that it is the revelation in Christ, which alone can satisfy them, and give the knowledge which is life eternal. The theology of the future may be in dogmatic assertions simpler than that of the past; but, if it is to be a reality, it must be even more definite in respect of the great fundamental mysteries of the Gospel, and deeper in its insight into their infinite significance, as the only keys to the meaning of this mysterious human life.

(2) Progress of Science.

The Rev. T. G. Bonney, B.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., Professor of Geology, University College, London; Hon. Canon of Manchester.

The titles of the subjects for discussion this afternoon suggest an antithesis, as though "the fixity of dogma" and "the progress of science" were incompatible. Everything, however, depends on the sense in which words are used. I have been instructed to confine myself to the second topic, but it is impossible, in this collocation, to avoid touching very briefly on the former. What is meant by dogma? Some apparently regard it as identical with doctrine; this, however, difficult as it may be to draw a line between the two terms, seems to me likely to mislead. The classic use means sometimes a philosophic conclusion, sometimes a resolution or decree. In the New Testament, where it occurs certainly only five times, it is applied once to the decree of the Apostles at Jerusalem, twice to an imperial decree, and twice to the ordinances of Judaism. So far as I know any definitions of its later ecclesiastical sense, these make the idea of authority more prominent than that of reason. Our schooldays furnish a very simple illustration of the distinction which I seek to draw. What we accepted on the authority of our master was dogma; what we learnt by understanding the reasons for it, that was doctrine. Let me take another example from the New Testament. Assuming that we believe what it tells us, the necessity for being born anew is a doctrine, but any statement as to the exact sense in which the members of a Church ought to understand these words would be a dogma. In both cases obviously the idea of authority is present, but the nature of it is very different. Hence, in speaking of dogma, I refer more especially to the conclusions or decrees of Churches in post-apostolic ages, and in that sense should hesitate to accept without qualification the phrase "fixity of dogma." This I think needful for two reasons. One, that as we in the Church of England do not believe any man or Church to be infallible, the dogma may be either inaccurate in terminology, or based upon insufficient knowledge, or even if not liable to these objections, the importance of the question may have been exaggerated, and to leave it open may prove to be a wiser and more charitable course. The power which can make, can also unmake. The other reason is this. Even though the terms of a statement are fixed, its significance in the process of time may be modified by the increase of knowledge and the broadening of thought. If, then, the progress of science seems to demand the withdrawal or

modification of dogma, we must not conclude either that collision is inevitable, or that concession should come only from the former side. I may add, however, that collision is more common with that which is popularly accepted as, than with that which really is, dogma—at any rate in our branch of the Church.

With this preliminary remark that I cannot admit of the absolute fixity of dogma, in whatever sense the word be used, and especially in that which I hold to be the correct one, I pass on to the question of the progress of science and its consequences. That science has progressed, we must all admit. One who, like myself, is drawing near to the evening tide of life, is almost startled when he contrasts the knowledge of to-day with that of his youth. But will this vast development—especially in regard to our knowledge of nature, its laws, and its history—make it more difficult for those now growing up to hold the faith in which we were reared and have lived. In short, is this progress in science forcing us to admit that the New Testament is largely mythical as a history, though none the less valuable for its ethical lessons, that the faith which rests on it has no other sanction than it can obtain from intrinsic merit?

At the outset, I must call attention to two difficulties which I think to be often needlessly magnified. Many people speak as if science and theology were natural enemies, like two powers fighting for the possession of a single territory. But their spheres of action, to a very large extent, though not altogether, are really distinct. Science deals with what we can discover by means of our senses, its methods of reasoning are almost wholly inductive; theology labours in a province which is inacessible to the instruments of scientific research, and its methods of reasoning are mainly deductive. God, in the language of strict science, is but a name for ultimate cause; God, in the language of theology, signifies this and much more—Ruler and Guide, Father and Friend.

We must therefore take care lest man join together what God hath put asunder, and by this ill-sorted union turn peace into discord. Points, however, there are where the territory of each has not only a common frontier, but also a zone of common ownership, and it is in this, that, as usual, difficulties arise.

Christianity, like its predecessor, Judaism, is something more than a collection of abstract doctrines and ethical precepts, which, however much they may affect our daily lives, cannot come into collision with the results at which we arrive by the exercise of our senses; it is also a history of persons, and this history requires us to accept as facts alleged events which are inexplicable by, even contrary to, our daily experience. It may be, as I shall presently explain more fully, that, since the Bible is a composite book, all its documents have not the same historical value; or that in some cases their meaning has been misunderstood; it may be that they have been tried by standards of accuracy which have no other warrant than popular opinion; but making all allowance for this, we must frankly admit that some of the most distinctive features of our faith as Christians arise from and rest upon a story which, to use the common term, is miraculous.

But while admitting this, let me utter a warning in regard to difficulties which are more verbal than real. As a mode of speaking, such terms as "law" and "miracle," "natural," and "supernatural," are convenient,

but we must be careful lest they entangle us in difficulties which in reality are our own creation. For instance, "law of nature" is only a convenient expression for an induction from phenomena. A stone, it is said, when dropped from my hand, falls to the ground because of the law of gravitation. But the statement only means that observation shows a certain sequence of events to be so universal as to indicate that they are consequences of a cause. The phrase, however, does not really tell us what this cause is. So far as we know, ultimate causes never can be disclosed by the methods of scientific investigation. These, as it has been often said, can tell us the "how" of things, but not the "why." Miracle also must have a cause, no less than the most common events of everyday life. If that cause act in an orderly way, the result is in accordance with "law," so that, in reality, the terms "law of nature" and "miracle" only mean that which is a matter of everyday experience, and that which is of the most exceptional kind. Again, the terms "natural and supernatural" are liable to mislead. If God be the cause at the back of nature—as I suppose no theist would hesitate to affirm—then we cannot admit the existence of any real division in His operations. In one sense everything is natural, because in the case of an All-perfect, All-wise Being, any dislocation of consequence and cause is impossible; but in another sense everything is supernatural, for in tracing up the most familar phenomena, we come at last to that which we cannot account for or understand.

There can be little doubt, however, that at the present time the gravest difficulties arise from the miraculous element in the Scriptures. It is their historical value which is disputed or denied. With such questions as those, which more than once have agitated the Church—questions as to the Divine nature, or the relation of the Godhead and the Manhood in Jesus Christ, science cannot deal; they belong, not to its province, but to that of the metaphysician; but with such a one as whether He rose from the dead, since it is a question of evidence, science, both directly and indirectly, is much concerned.

I make this assertion with the more confidence, because one of our most eminent men of science, who felt himself compelled to take the agnostic position, frankly admitted not long before his death: "Physical science, in fact, has had nothing directly to do with the criticism of the Gospels; it is wholly incompetent to furnish demonstrative evidence that any statement made in these histories is untrue. Indeed, modern physiology can find parallels in nature for events of apparently the most eminently supernatural kind recounted in some of those histories." Again, in another place he grants that there is no impossibility except such as involves a contradiction in terms. It may be improbable that a man should walk on the water, be born without human intervention, rise again, but we cannot say that it is impossible; for we are only at the beginning of our knowledge of nature, and cannot set bounds to its possibilities.*

These passages seem to me fair statements of the case. We must admit that, as Christians, we believe in things which in themselves are improbable. How far, then, is the question of evidence affected by recent discoveries, whether these be either strictly scientific or attained in

---

* T. H. Huxley, Collected Works, Vol. V., pages 197, 200, and 251.

the field of literature by scientific methods? Let us consider first those which may seem to tell most strongly against us, namely, the gradual limitation of the field assigned to the "supernatural," and the change in opinion as to the historic value of certain portions of the Scriptures. With the first I have already dealt, so may dismiss it by repeating that I recognize no real distinction between the natural and the supernatural, for I believe that everything is of God, with Whom is no variableness, and I admit that "the miraculous" is a relative term, dependent on the knowledge of each age. The second seems to be a more serious matter. I cannot deny that the increase of scientific knowledge has deprived parts of the earlier books of the Bible of the historical value which was generally attributed to them by our forefathers. The story of Creation in the book Genesis, unless we play fast and loose, either with words or with science, cannot be brought into harmony with what we have learnt from geology. Its ethnological statements are imperfect, if not sometimes inaccurate; the story of the Fall, of the Flood, and of the Tower of Babel, are incredible in their present form. Some historical element may underlie many of the traditions in the first eleven chapters of that Book, but this we cannot hope to recover. They proclaim spiritual facts of the highest importance, such as that God, and God alone, is Creator and Ruler of all, that there is an innate depravity in the nature of man, that sin entails suffering, and the sinner cannot escape from His all-seeing eye, though in the midst of judgment He remembers mercy. In short, these narratives are allegorical, not historical. We receive them as inspired, and this none the less when we learn, as of late years we have learnt, the source whence they were derived; but they are spiritual, not scientific, truths.

Investigation also into other books of the Old Testament, by methods which in themselves are strictly scientific, indicates that some of these have been compiled or "edited," or have been, in a few instances, written at dates later than those to which they were formerly assigned, so that they contain traditional instead of contemporaneous records of events. If so, we must admit that the miraculous element probably looms too large in these books, for its growth is usually favoured by the process of time. As the result, we must be prepared to leave the accuracy of some narratives an open question, to carry them to a "suspense account"; to grant that some prophecies are homiletic rather than predictive; in short, to concede a larger share than was formerly done to the human element in the Old Testament. This means a change—and that an important one—in our ideas of the nature and the function of inspiration. Let me, however, point out that this does not bring us into collision with any dogma. The Church of England, very wisely, has never committed itself to any definition of inspiration, or to precise statements as to its functions. No doubt both the one and the other have been attempted, nay, have been assumed to exist; but the most positive assertions have possessed no higher sanction than popular clamour. Even such a statement as this, which I will quote, though uttered by one deservedly respected and loved, when scrutinized, becomes only an expression of private opinion; "For Christians it will be enough to know that our Lord Jesus Christ set the seal of His infallible sanction on the whole of the Old Testament . . . the trustworthiness of the Old Testament is, in fact, inseparable from the trustworthiness of

our Lord Jesus Christ." * Not only is this an expression of private opinion, but also it is somewhat daring. I might indeed demur to the assumption that anyone by quoting from a collection of ancient documents gives an equal sanction to every part of them; but letting that pass, I enquire whether the speaker could be certain that he had solved the profoundest of all mysteries, the co-existence in one person, of the Divinity, with its necessary omniscience, and the Humanity, with its equally necessary limitations.

But to return; if we admit so much in regard to the Old Testament, do we not detract from the historic value of the New. I cannot deny that to some extent this must be, but we shall find that it is only in matters of unimportant detail. The books of the New Testament stand on a very different footing to most of those in the older covenant. It is true that the Gospels are not, as far as we know, strictly contemporaneous records, so we must admit the possibility of variations and even inaccuracies in details being introduced by oral tradition; but the interval was too short for these introductions to be serious, and we know that the matters of doctrinal significance—such as the birth, the divinity, and the resurrection of the Saviour—were regarded from the first as integral parts of the new covenant. In other words, such admissions as I make do not affect the credibility of the New Testament (leaving for a moment the question of miracles aside) more than they would that of histories of the present century, for it is notoriously impossible to be certain about every detail of events which have happened within the memory of men now living.

I may venture, I think, to say that recent investigation has strengthened rather than weakened the value of the Gospels and other documents in the New Testament, as evidence for the events which they relate. It has been shown that they cannot be fabrications of comparatively late date, that they were written, if not in all cases by eye-witnesses, at least by those who were in constant intercourse with eye-witnesses, and that the main outlines of their story were from the very first accepted by the Church. This subject, however, I need not pursue farther, because it has been already dealt with at this Congress. So I pass on to matters more strictly within the province of science. Have recent advances here increased our difficulties of belief? In my opinion they have not, because they have tended to bridge over that artificial chasm between miracle and law. Two or three examples will bring out my meaning better than many words; and with these I shall conclude.

I will mention, first, the phenomena of hypnotism, and faith-healing, as it is sometimes called. No doubt these too often are mixed up with and discredited by a large amount of deception and imposture, and this alone precludes me, under my present conditions, from more than a passing reference; but there are also well-attested facts, results of strict scientific enquiry, which, in the usual sense of the term, are miraculous, because they are not explicable by, sometimes are discordant from, the ordinary laws of nature.

Passing on to less treacherous ground, we must admit that recent scientific enquiry has demonstrated the extraordinary effects which may be produced by very slight alterations in the composition of a substance.

---

* Canon Liddon, quoted by Professor Huxley, "Collected Essays," vol. iv., p. 208.

I refer more especially to the marvellous results which have rewarded the investigations of Professor Roberts-Austen and others. For instance, gold is malleable, and so is lead; yet if gold be alloyed with one-thousandth part of its weight of lead, it becomes, though unchanged in appearance, quite brittle. Again, the addition of one part in two thousand of aluminium to molten iron at once makes the latter almost as fluid as water. Another result is yet more surprising: manganese, as is well known, affects the properties of steel. If it be present in a proportion less than 2·75 per cent. the steel is toughened, after that amount the alloy becomes more and more brittle, reaching a maximum when there is from four to five per cent. of manganese, but, when the latter varies from seven to twenty per cent. the alloy again is strengthened and toughened. Did time permit, other like cases might be quoted. Now these results are inexplicable, sometimes anomalous; the cause, if we may so call it, seems wholly disproportionate to the effect; they are really some of nature's miracles.

We have then learnt that small things may produce great effects; but we have also learnt that these small things may readily escape notice. The last two years have provided such lessons. If anything might be supposed to be well known, it was the composition of atmospheric air. Yet Lord Rayleigh and Professor W. Ramsay have shown that all the while there lurked in it a small quantity of a substance, probably new, which they have named argon. By the researches of these investigators, with Mr. Crookes, Dr. Norman Lockyer and others, this gas, besides sundry novel elementary substances, has been detected elsewhere. We may then say that science has emphatically declared, not only the effects which small things can produce, but also the ease with which they may be overlooked even by careful investigators. Are not these things an allegory? Is it not rash to assume that there is no variation in the physical conditions of a so-called miracle, and of an event of daily experience?

Yet more, the chemist formerly thought that all known substances were composed of elementary atoms, these being independent units which differed one from another in physical and other properties. But now the most competent judges are more and more disposed to regard all these forms of matter as different conditions, stable it may be under ordinary circumstances, of a primary something, and to consider their differences due to variation either in mode of motion or in relative position, rather than to an inalienable independency. If this be so,* it follows that changes in substance, as we should call them, will be no more improbabilities on *á priori* considerations than the well known conversions of motion into heat, light, and electricity. The man of science, in investigating the constitution of the universe, can get no farther back than Energy, but is he then very far away from God?

Lastly, much of late years has been heard about evolution. I do not propose to discuss this controversial subject, but wish merely to point out a consequence of accepting the hypothesis. The evolutionist maintains that throughout all nature "an increasing purpose runs,"

* The most recent, and, perhaps, the most suggestive discussion of this subject will be found in the address of Professor W. M. Hicks to the Mathematical and Physical Section, delivered (while this paper was in type) at the Ipswich meeting of the British Association.

producing everywhere in things, inanimate and animate, growth and development, from the embryonic to the perfected, from the generalized to the specialized; while he admits that in this are certain "beginnings" which he cannot explain. If, then, this "law" of evolution be true, I venture to maintain that the Christ of history cannot be the natural outcome of His times and His environment, and that the circumstances point to the epoch being one of those "beginnings" when new forces (if we may so call them) come into play and ordinary experience may sometimes lead us to incorrect conclusions; in other words, I maintain that while recent progress in science tends to discredit thaumaturgy, to banish superstition, and to strip away parasitic growths from Christianity, it also tends to make the cardinal facts and doctrines of the latter less, rather than more, difficult of belief.

ADDRESSES.

(1) Fixity of Dogma.

The Rev. C. Lloyd Engström, Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society, 13, Buckingham Street, Strand, W.C. (Boyle Lecturer, 1887-8-9).

The problem we have this afternoon to consider has probably never been more clearly or eloquently stated, from his point of view, than by the late Professor Tyndall, in words which have become classical. At the close of his address as President of the British Association, at Belfast, in 1874, after stating that human nature, as a whole, must allow room for a Shakespeare, a Raphael, a Beethoven, a Carlyle, as well as for a Newton, a Boyle, a Kant, a Darwin, he thus proceeded: "And if, unsatisfied with them all, the human mind, with the yearning of a pilgrim for his distant home, will turn to the Mystery from which it has emerged, seeking so to fashion it as to give unity to thought and faith; so long as this is done, not only without intolerance or bigotry of any kind, but with the enlightened recognition that ultimate fixity of conception is here unattainable, and that each succeeding age must be held free to fashion the Mystery in accordance with its own needs, then, casting aside all the restrictions of Materialism, I would affirm this to be a field for the noblest exercise of what, in contrast with the knowing faculties, may be called the creative faculties of man." Observe how in the same breath he claims the highest place for religious conceptions, and denies their ultimate fixity. Before we leave Professor Tyndall, let me quote like words, in the preface to his address (when published separately). "The facts of religious feeling are to me," he writes, "as certain as the facts of physics. But the world, I hold, will have to distinguish between the feeling and its forms, and to vary the latter in accordance with the intellectual condition of the age." To-day, I take it, I am expected to state some facts and offer some arguments to show that we, as Christians, can, with the frankest acceptance of all progress of science, still reasonably justify fixity of dogma.

I do not propose, except incidentally, defining the terms of my subject. For, contrary to many thinkers on these subjects, I am generally averse to all attempts to define, on the simple ground that nothing which really exists is capable of exact and complete definition—at least, so it appears to me. And I am supported by weighty authorities. In his latest sermon at S. Paul's Cathedral, on September 29th,

entitled, "S. Michael," Canon Scott-Holland—with that powerful originality which with deep spiritual insight makes him, in my judgment, quite our foremost living preacher—said, "We cannot round off our certified knowledge, for ever and always what we know fringes off into what we know not. There is no agnostic line to be drawn at which we can say, 'Up to here I know perfectly, and I know nothing further.' No one thing can be really known at all without knowing everything, since each particle of the universe is obviously determinate of the whole. Nothing can be cut out of these infinite relations and examined and classified by itself."—*Church Bells*, October 4th, p. 87. You will doubtless, also, recollect what Lord Tennyson wrote about the "flower in the crannied wall."

Now, if my view, as supported by Canon Scott-Holland and the late Poet Laureate, be correct, then I am not only absolved from defining the terms of my subject, but much light is thrown upon the subject itself. Dogma in the hard and fast sense is absurd. If we know anything, we know that our knowledge is limited, and therefore at the best our dogmas must be capable of growth. "We know in part," wrote S. Paul, and the whole Bible confirms such agnosticism. We *com*prehend nothing; consequently, "ultimate fixity of conception" is, in one very true and important sense, "unattainable."

The real question is whether we can so *ap*prehend truth in matters of religious belief as to be practically sure that our apprehension has in it the nature of certainty and permanence. It would probably save some earnest believers much anxiety —I know it would have saved me much in my earlier search for truth—if they could at the outset accept the fact that our religious creed, like all our creeds, must be subject to certain human conditions. Now it is of the very nature of man, because he is man and not God, that his knowledge should be subject to growth, and consequently to change, and this possibility of increased knowledge, affecting, of course, his creed, is part of his nobility as well as of his imperfection. But further, it is wrong to shut one's eyes to new knowledge on any subject, but never so wrong as in the sphere of religion. The love of truth clearly belongs to a very high region of moral and spiritual activity, and we must be on our watch against setting in opposition to the inward love of truth the external truth we believe in.

In a very remarkable address given by the Master of Trinity at the Annual Meeting of the Christian Evidence Society this year (which will be found at the end of the annual report), that honoured and distinguished scholar and most reverent believer laid very great stress on the high Christian duty of not in any way discouraging the frankest enquiry on the part of the young in the sphere of religion. From his own long experience of the fatal results of such discouragement he spoke with great warmth of feeling, and when naming the chief requisites in Christian advocates, he said, "The *first* requisite for this sacred and greatly-needed work is eager, unbiassed Love of Truth—Truth at any cost." And I myself have ventured to say times without number that, as from the Christian standpoint we are bound to use every gift of God according to its nature—which in the case of the intellect is absolute freedom to look all round—and we use it in the noblest way when we investigate the highest object, *i.e.*, Himself, therefore religious thinking should be of all thinking the most absolutely free, though at the same time absolutely humble, absolutely reverent.

You may think perhaps that having been called to bless fixity of dogma, I have cursed it altogether; but wait till you hear me out. We have been magnifying the Love of Truth, but are you sure that that means the death knell of permanence in the Christian creed? Apparently Professor Tyndall thought so. I think precisely the contrary, and I trust to help you to do the same. It will not be denied by those who are no lovers of dogma that such men as Tyndall, Huxley, and Herbert Spencer, have

insisted with a splendid intensity of earnestness, which we cannot doubt has been thoroughly genuine, in the Love of Truth. It would hardly be praising them too highly to apply to them some words of Dr. Montagu Butler in the address from which I have already quoted, "the 'white plume' of light and truth has been their 'oriflamme.'" To seek truth at any cost has been to such men at their best moments a "categorical imperative."

Now, the more we magnify this devotion to truth, the quicker we shall reach the goal of the fixity of dogma. And why? Because no one has a right to insist on the obligations of truth-seeking unless he *intensely* believes in Truth and in Duty. Then that is his creed. That is *his* fixed dogma. An Oscar Wilde may, with others like-minded, speak lightly of truth and duty, but men of the stamp of Professor Tyndall would in righteous indignation strike to the ground the man who would impugn the sincerity of their convictions as to the supremacy of these ideals, and I do not doubt that they would echo the noble words of Dr. Copleston, Bishop of Colombo, in the preface (p. vii) of his "Buddhism," when, after expressly saying that he had "aimed at not merely an impartial but a generous treatment," continues: "Impartial, in a sense, it was impossible for me to be. The questions raised are not for me open questions. I start with immovable convictions about the main principles of truth and goodness."

But perhaps you will say, Is that all? What has that to do with Christian dogma? My friends, it has everything to do with it. Consider what a wonderful and all-embracing creed is this, which has no real meaning unless it asserts that everywhere and every when Truth and Duty—and, I think, no one will blame me for adding Self-sacrifice—must be held supreme. Observe what is necessarily implied in such moral convictions, and whither anyone, who is mastered by them, must, if intelligent enough to see the consequences, be led. Such a man holds, as the guiding star of his life, and of all lives, that if we could pass to a back eternity, there those principles would be found supreme, and that if we could project our gaze into the most distant future, there, too, they would be found supreme. And not only so for this earth and us men, but everywhere in the immensity of space. But to state this is really to state his creed, for what is a creed but the expression in thought and word of one's deepest convictions?

But we must go farther. Truth, duty, self-sacrifice, are words absolutely without meaning, except as applied to *persons*. To use them of *things* is nonsense, and to regard them as *abstractions* is to evacuate them of all reality. Consequently, the direct implication from the moral convictions of a Tyndall, a Huxley, a Spencer, is the fixed dogma of the existence in all eternity and immensity of a Person or Persons who, in virtue of His or Their essential truth, and righteousness, and love, is, or are, supreme. Now both science and philosophy demand a unity in this supremacy, and thus we are landed in the fullest belief in the noblest conception of one God. But a sole moral personality is unthinkable, so that the very thought of personality, which is implicit in any high devotion to Truth, carries one on to the dogma of a plurality of Persons in the Godhead. It may seem strange that the Love of Truth and Goodness should take us so far, but so they must, provided only they are the supreme powers in any man's life. A passionate and devoted loyalty to Truth, far from being the solvent of dogma, necessarily leads to the re-establishment of its eternal fixity. And unless the Love of Truth means that a man would cheerfully die to give effect to its commands, we can neither honour him, nor listen to his claims on behalf of the progress of science.

It may be objected that Tyndall, Huxley, and Spencer have been the readiest to denounce the fixity of dogma; but it is not incumbent upon me to justify their

intellectual philosophy when it is so manifestly, and in the highest degree, inconsistent with the ruling passion of their lives. Renan seems to have had a clearer insight as to the consequences of the new views. "We are living" he said, "on the perfume of an empty vase." What an exquisite comparison. What a disastrous outlook! On that point, however, I need say the less, because Mr. Balfour has so lately shown, with astonishing force and unsurpassed brilliancy, the frightful moral consequences bound up in the creed of "Naturalism."

. But having thus got so far in the re-establishment of the fixity of dogma, may we not travel still further? The Christian creed contains facts of Eternity—these we have been considering—but it also contains facts in Time. I would ask, May there not be reasonably in regard to these also an unchanging creed? Earlier in this speech I observed that "our religious creed must be subject to certain human conditions." This it might have *seemed*—only seemed—was weakening the Christian position; now I may certainly strengthen it thereby. For no reasonable sceptic is prepared to practically throw overboard belief in all history and all science. And yet I need hardly say to any thorough-going thinker, that, theoretically speaking, no single statement of history or science can be considered perfectly certain. Well, in the same way, I am prepared to allow that every fact in the human life of Christ may *theoretically* be considered open to question. But I claim that, for all *practical* purposes, they stand as certain as the most certain things in ordinary history and ordinary science. The most certain are those for which there is the greatest accumulation and convergence of evidence; and, as one who has devoted his life to the most impartial investigation of the great historical dogmas of Christianity, I assert, without the least hesitation, that for nothing can more satisfactory and cumulative proof be found. The more impartially and the more fully one enquires, the more satisfied one becomes that the "things most surely believed among us" are neither "cunningly devised fables," nor myths of genuine growth: *e.g.*, every attempt to explain the belief in Christ's Resurrection by any hypothesis except that of its historical reality has ignominiously failed.

Then there are the facts, uniting Eternity and Time, among which the Incarnate Deity of Christ holds a unique pre-eminence. Take the Sermon on the Mount, which, as you know, is not uncommonly set almost in opposition to Christian dogmas. Well, look at that discourse, take it as it stands, consider it as uttered by a Jew, brought up in and certainly holding the strongest belief as to the absolute supremacy of Jehovah, and then consider that Jehovah could not have spoken in more authoritative accents than this Jesus of Nazareth. So speaking, He must have been either God, or a blasphemer or a madman. And who that has either self-respect, or a reputation to lose, will dare to assert the second or third of these alternatives as tolerable or possible?

Yes, it is becoming more and more plain that the undoubted facts of the New Testament can, when duly examined, take shape in only one creed. . And so it is that the noblest Unitarian writers use—they cannot do otherwise—language respecting our Lord which it would be well if all Trinitarians would use with like sincerity. It was no surprise to me, but it might surprise many of you, to read in the final volume of Hibbert Lectures, viz., those for 1894, by Dr. James Drummond, the Principal of "Manchester College," Oxford (which is the very highest seminary of English Unitarian teaching), his statement as to the doctrine of the Trinity. He says, "we must, however, observe that there were certain elements in Christian experience, which, when taken up and interpreted by Greek philosophy, necessarily resulted in this doctrine." At considerable length, on pages 203 to 206, and with beautiful devoutness and sympathy, he shows the naturalness of the orthodox implications,

though not, of course, fully endorsing them. I have often thought that the apparent disappearance of the fixity of dogmas in times like those we have been passing through resembles the solution of a crystal. It seems to vanish, but, give the solution time, and it will necessarily re-form into its old crystalline shape. Men like the great Athanasius formulated the Christian faith as they did, because the facts admitted of no other creed. Thank God, this century will not close before a like truth-seeking examination has ended in the same way.

Change, indeed, in minor ways there may be, there ought to be. Christianity is a life, and Christianity grows. The child grows into the boy, the boy into the man. There is much change, but more identity. The members, the organs, are found alike in the child, the boy, the man, but they are larger, stronger, more perfect. The Christian creed may and ought to grow, but its main dogmas can never cease to be. "Jesus Christ" is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever."

---

(2) Progress of Science.

The Rev. Samuel Kinns, Ph.D., F.R.A.S., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Minories.

I appreciate the honour your committee has conferred upon me by asking me to say a few words on the "Religious Problems Pressing upon the Rising Generation Connected with the Progress of Science;" at the same time I feel an amount of diffidence lest I should fail to do sufficient justice to a matter of so much importance.

The progress of science in every department has of late years been so remarkable, that it would take many hours, instead of fifteen minutes, to refer in a very slight degree to what has been done. I will venture therefore to address this meeting for the few minutes allotted to me on one only of the numerous problems of the day, viz., whether the events given in the first chapter of Genesis are in harmony with the most recent scientific discoveries, and whether there be evidence that the narrative is a Divine revelation and not of Babylonian origin.

As I have more especially to speak on the "Progress of Science," I will say a few words upon the subject of Photography as applied to Astronomical observations, because I think it helps to confirm the early events in the Biblical narrative. The chief feature of photography, when thus applied, is that stars and nebulæ by its means have been discovered which our best and largest telescopes have not been able without its aid to reveal. Let me give you an instance. The cluster in the constellation of Taurus, called the Pleiades, which for thousands of years was thought to be composed of only seven stars, was found to consist of many more as soon as a telescope was turned upon it; so that Robert Hooke, in 1664, with an instrument having an object glass scarcely exceeding two inches in diameter, was able to see seventy-eight stars. Mons. C. Wolf, of the Paris Observatory, in 1876, devoted three years of unremitting labour to the formation of an accurate chart of this cluster, and his catalogue consisted of 671 stars. In 1885, however, two brothers Messrs. Paul and Prosper Henry, by means of very sensitive photographic plates, revealed the presence of 1,421 stars, and thus the work of three hours by means of photography was superior in every respect to Wolf's work of three years. Much greater things were afterwards done by these brothers and other astronomers, so that the number has now been brought up to 2,326 stars in this cluster, which for so many years was supposed to consist of only seven. Dr. Isaac Roberts has also shown that there are several nebulæ in this remarkable group.

Another very interesting discovery was made in reference to the great nebula in

Andromeda. Much has been said and much written about it; but on Dr. Roberts taking a photograph of it with his twenty inch reflector, new and striking features were at once revealed. The dark bands that had been noticed by other astronomers were found to form parts of divisions between symmetrical rings of nebulous matter surrounding the large and comparatively condensed centre of the nebula.

Much excitement prevailed on these discoveries being announced, for the photographs threw a strong light on the probable truth of the Nebular hypothesis first enunciated by Laplace a century ago; whose theory assumed that the various solar systems throughout space were originally nebulæ from which those systems had been evolved. Whilst some of these nebulæ have this spiral form indicating a centrifugal motion, many others have apparently had the same form for the past hundred years, of which the Dumb-bell Nebula is an instance.

Science has not yet been able to explain how it is that these nebulæ are luminous, but we are assured from it that light is one of the earliest conditions of matter that is afterwards to become worlds.

Here, then, is a confirmation of the first Divine edict, "Let there be light," for, judging from what takes place with other nebulæ, we learn that our solar system was first a luminous mass of highly attenuated matter. Then this nebulous mass, extending through space from where the sun is to beyond the confines of the far distant Neptune, was set in motion by the Divine power, resulting in the condensation of such matter to form the central sun, and next the worlds revolving around it—which worlds were at first as hot as the sun itself, but, gradually cooling down, the various gases which surrounded the heated mass condensed, to form, in the case of our earth, the waters of the ocean, and the atmosphere, miscalled in the Authorized Version the "Firmament," but properly rendered in the Revised Version "expanse."

By and by great convulsions took place, and the rocks were upheaved, forming dry ground, upon which by the Divine power there sprang forth plant life, the order of which is plainly manifested in the rocks, as at first consisting of cryptogams, such as ferns, lichens, lycopods, etc. I would here notice that the word *deshe*, translated grass, might with equal propriety have been rendered sproutage. Grass, such as forms the food of animals, did not appear till much later on. Cryptogamic plants are found as low down as the Silurian rocks.

Next upwards we find in the Lower Devonian strata the herb yielding seed, that is to say phænogams, or flowering plants, such as the conifers, and afterwards in the Carboniferous rocks are found a low order of fruit trees, such as the trigonocarpon; the higher class of fruit trees coming much later on.

Now arises a very great difficulty; an eminent scientist when attacking this chapter, said that this story could not possibly be of Divine origin, for the sequence of creative events is in direct variance with science.

Take for instance the creation of the plants on the third day, and the creation of the sun on the fourth. Had they, he said, been days of twenty-four hours each, then the sequence would not have been quite so absurd, for the plants might possibly have waited for the sun that short time, but now that believers in the Biblical narratives admit that the so-called days were very long periods, it would be an outrage to common sense to suppose that the sun was created thousands of years after the plants.

He was correct in saying that we believe the days to have been periods of great length, for we can prove that the Hebrew word *yôm*, translated day, admits of that meaning. He was also correct in saying that it would be a great absurdity for us to suppose that the plants were created before the sun. We do not, however, believe anything of the kind, and the narrative does not say so, but states that after the plant-life had existed for some time, the sun and moon were appointed for signs and for

seasons. The statement "He made two great lights," does not mean that God then created them. The Hebrew word translated "He made," is *asah*, which is frequently used in the Bible to signify appointed. Take, for instance, 1 Kings xii. 31: "He (that is king Jeroboam) made priests of the lowest of the people." Now to make a priest would be to appoint him, not create him, and the word used is also *asah*. Then in Psalm civ. 19, we read, "He appointed the moon for seasons," and here also the word is *asah*. This fits in entirely with the scientific discovery that during the early part at least of the Carboniferous period there was a similar climate from pole to pole, and afterwards there were distinct seasons. You see, therefore, that in this instance the Biblical narrative is correct, and the philosopher wrong.

Another objection made by the same scientist was that the creation of animal life in the sea is placed in Genesis 1 after the creation of plant life on land, whereas it can be shown that before the Carboniferous period all the four great sub-kingdoms existed in the sea. This seemed to many people an unanswerable objection; it can, however, I think, be readily met. The words in the Authorized Version are not, "and now God created animal life in the sea," but, "God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life." A more correct translation would be that in the margin of the Revised Version; "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures." This surely might imply a great increase of genera and species.

Well, that great geologist, Sir Charles Lyell, said that when he was examining the Triassic beds in the Austrian Alps, he found that out of forty-nine genera of fossil molluscs only eleven of them were to be found in the previous rocks. Here then there were proofs of a great increase of genera and species after the plant life had existed for a long time on land, and again the Biblical narrative scores a victory.

Next we have in the sequence of Genesis the birds mentioned before the sea monsters improperly translated whales. Now in the New Red Sandstone footprints were found which Professors Owen and Hitchcock and Dr. Dana believed to be those of birds, and the remains of the Icthyosaurus, Plesiosaurus and other sea monsters were discovered in abundance in the *succeeding* Lias strata.

Also we find remains of great beasts, such as the Dinotherium and Megatherium, existing before those of cattle, and cattle before man. Therefore, taking the groupings as well as the six great divisions, we have altogether *fifteen* events in their right sequence in this first chapter, and the number of ways in which fifteen things can be arranged is no less than a billion; that is to say that the first fifteen letters of the alphabet could be written down in one billion rows without two rows being exactly alike. Hence it would have been impossible for anyone to have written the narrative by guess-work, or by any amount of reasoning, with a billion chances against him, unless such a writer possessed a perfect knowledge of geology. This knowledge, however, could not have been attained without visiting and examining all the mountain ranges in the world. Let me ask, do you think that this careful examination was carried out either by the Assyrians or the Egyptians? Had they ships and steamboats to enable them to visit the Andes in America, the Himalaya in India, or the Blue Mountains in Australia? Most certainly they had not, and therefore geology was unknown to them. How, then, could the writer of this narrative have been so accurate in the sequence of events? There is but one answer; the great Creator must Himself have revealed it to him, whether it were Adam, Enoch, Moses, or anyone else; and hence the Bible has gained a grand triumph, for here in the very first chapter there is a striking mathematical proof of a direct revelation from God to man.

With regard to the Biblical narrative having been derived from Babylonian sources,

I would ask, is there in the accounts that have come down to us upon the cuneiform tablets the same scientific exactitude in sequence which I have pointed out to you as existing in the first chapter of Genesis? Most certainly there is not, for the events are very confused, and also are mixed up with a large amount of polytheism. Such accounts therefore can only be perverted versions of an original Divine revelation.

Our great Christian philosopher, Sir William Dawson, has said:—

"Had the pen of inspiration written but the words 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,' and added no more, these words alone would have borne the impress of their heavenly birth, and would, if received in faith, have done much for the progress of the human mind. These words contain a negation of hero worship, star worship, animal worship, and every other form of idolatry. They still more emphatically deny atheism and materialism, and point upwards from nature to its Spiritual Creator, the one Triune, the Eternal, the Self-Existent, the All-Pervading, the Almighty God."

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. J. J. LIAS, Rector of East Bergholt; and Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral.

I SHOULD not have undertaken to address you this afternoon, but for the fact that for twelve years of my life I held a parish in the centre of a University town, and, therefore, had special means of becoming acquainted with points of difficulty which affected many of the young people with whom I came into contact. This subject has, therefore, been to a certain extent forced upon my consideration, and I have ventured to rise this afternoon to state to you some of the results at which I have arrived. I think we are deeply indebted to those who have already addressed you on this most important subject: and there is only one point in the brilliant paper of my friend Professor Bonney with which I do not find myself in full agreement, and that is where he said that we were not able to accept the Mosaic account of creation except in the form of an allegory. I think it is perfectly clear that there is a great deal of allegory in the earlier chapters of Genesis; but in regard to this particular point it appears to me that the Hebrew writer does not call upon us to look upon his account of creation as having been written at all in chronological order. I do not believe that that eloquent description of creation follows at all the order of time, but simply the order of thought; and therefore all elaborate attempts either of attack or defence upon this particular point appear to me to be somewhat unnecessary. But as I have said, during my residence in the University town of Cambridge, I came into contact with a great deal of what I may call very earnest unbelief, or rather I might say that I found a great many people labouring under very serious difficulties; and the way I at ast found myself able to meet them was somewhat of this kind, by pointing out that the apparent hostility between religion and science has been very largely a matter of statement. I showed that it is not that the doctrines of Christianity are in any degree indefensible, but that sometimes the manner in which they have been stated was distinctly so. Just take an instance. When we are ignorant of many of the details concerning a question, we very often express ourselves imperfectly upon it. We still speak incorrectly, as our forefathers did, from a scientific point of view, of the sun rising and setting; and it appears to me that doctrinal statements made in ignorance of the truths of science would in the same way be to a large extent inaccurate. If our forefathers had known all that we know now, they would not have stated their dogmas in precisely the form in which they did state them. We owe a debt of gratitude to Bishop Barry for pointing out to-day that dogma is a matter not of opinion but of fact. In past ages it was made not the expression of fact, but of opinion; and latterly, with the truths of science before us, we see more clearly, and must make our doctrinal statements base themselves upon certain indisputable spiritual facts. There have been inadequate statements with regard to religious truths. Take, for instance, some of the statements with regard to the Being of God. A young person once came to me very much confused in mind upon this subject, and said that he was obliged to give up the old notion of faith in the Being of God. I said to him, "Get rid of the

old notion of an autocrat, and substitute that of a beneficent force, and look upon God as the final force behind all that is." Then, when we come to think of Him in that way, as a benevolent force, we find that we have realized the principle that God is love. Take those other questions to which reference has been made to-day—the statement of the opinions of justification, of atonement, of predestination, and the like. Do not we find now that there is an irresistible necessity forced upon us of a different way of stating these great questions from that in which they were stated fifty years ago. Then there is the question of eschatology; and on that a perfect revolution has gone over all denominations of Christians, so that they dare not state their doctrines in the terrible way in which they were used to state them a century or two ago. So that my principle is this, that while the facts on which our dogma exists remain unchanged, the statement of them is altogether altered, just as the explanations of the facts of physical science which hold the field at the present time are altogether different from what they were in the infancy of science. Therefore, the great thing needed at the present time is to reconcile the first principles of our religion with the progress of human thought and science. I believe that if we hold firmly to the main facts upon which Christianity is based, and refrain from interfering with them by forcing people to accept our human explanations, the progress of Christian thought and belief will become more certain, and swifter than ever before. And when I speak of the main facts of Christianity, I speak of the Holy Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Resurrection, and of the fact that Christ has sent His Holy Spirit into this world to carry on His great principle of sacrifice and of love, and that a society has thus been formed to carry on Christ's work of sacrifice and love in this world, and lives in the hope of "the Resurrection of the Flesh, and the life of the world to come."

The Rev. MONTAGU F. OSBORNE, Vicar of Embleton; and Honorary Canon of Newcastle.

BISHOP BARRY very wisely, at the outset of his address, reminded us of the necessity of defining our meaning of the word "dogma." That is most necessary, because it is held in two senses. The first, which is the true sense, means that which has been taught and believed in the Church of Christ. But the other and popular meaning is the attempt to include in these doctrines explanations of what are called the mysteries of religion, and trying to teach them to all, even to children. It was said to me not long ago, "Why not try to teach your Christianity without those dogmas." As if Christianity was distinct from the great doctrines of the Christian faith. Well, we use the word dogma in the first sense, to include the great articles of the Creeds, and, speaking to Churchmen, the main statements in the Prayer-book also. Bishop Barry also used the word "essential." But the consideration of what is, or is not, essential would now lead us into pitfalls and by-fields. The question is, Can we give up any of the articles of our faith, and if so, which of them can we give up? The onus lies upon those who are objectors to state to which of these articles we must give up fixity. Surely there must be some meaning to the phrase, "the faith once delivered to the saints," and the Apostle not only says, "hold to it," but "fight" for it, as foreseeing what might occur in later days. Our penultimate premier lately called undogmatic theology a "monstrosity." The onus, I say, lies upon the objectors to say—to borrow an agricultural phrase—to which of the articles of the Christian faith we ought to deny "fixity of tenure," and to which at the present day the Church is bound to give "notice to quit." But there is another great question, whether it is inconsistent with what has been said—that we are to give fixity of tenure to Christian dogma—that the Church can or can not re-state some of the articles and dogmas of former times, or whether they do not admit of being re-stated. I wish I had the exact words of the Archbishop of Canterbury in his reply to the recent Papal letter, but they are to this effect: There is no doubt that Christian truths present themselves, and Christian ideas present themselves, to Christian minds in a different way in one age to what they do in another, and it is the duty of the Christian Church to give this most important subject their consideration. The Archbishop of York also, in his sermon said, "not every formula which represents even the best theological opinion of its age is therefore fitted to unite men for all time." Then comes the question of the different way theological doctrines address themselves to the Eastern mind and to the Western mind, and it has been commented upon by many writers of the present day, whether our Church has not inherited too large a portion of the Latin view of certain articles of

the Christian faith as handed down by S. Augustine. There are some modes of stating Christian doctrine also, which shock men's minds in one age, and do not do so in another. Take the question of anathema. Formerly it was always in the minds of the imposers that the warnings of the Church would lead to repentance and to absolution. But it was not necessarily so. For instance, when the late Pope excommunicated the late King of Italy, it happened that not long afterwards the King of Italy was dying. What happened? Did the Pope send to him a message warning him to repent of his errors? Not at all; but he took off the excommunication—the anathema—by telegraph, and sent a message, "Depart in peace." So that the words used by our theological ancestors are not now understood with the same meaning as they were used by them. We should also be thankful that the Church has not multiplied dogmas, and that our reformers did not attempt elaborate statements of doctrine on such subjects as the Atonement and Inspiration. Simplification is a leading feature of modern theology, as of science and inventions.

The Rev. George Ensor, Vicar of Peel, Isle of Man.

It is one of the great advantages of our Congress meetings that our Readers and Speakers must be brief. It is one of the great disadvantages connected with the same fact that our Readers and Speakers, especially our scientific friends, are able only to present us with the results of their studies, without having time to show us the methods and the machinery by which they arrive at those results. For instance, Professor Bonney has stated to us his opinions as to the historical view of the Book of the Scriptures; but time did not allow him to place us in possession of the series of arguments by which he arrived at his conclusions. We must, therefore, either accept his authority, or else go and investigate the whole subject for ourselves. Some scientific friends seem to think that scientific statements are infallible. Well, now let us take the question of fixity of dogma. If the Church has been credited, or has been aspersed, with a too rigid adherence to fixity of dogma, surely the science of geology is not open to the same aspersion. Those who have watched the progress of geological science know that here at least we do not find unanimity, but that we find a variety of opinion which varies with the rising and the setting of the sun. Those of us who are bold enough to believe in the historical credibility of the Book of Genesis can bide our time, and we believe we shall be found to be right in the long run. Again, I believe that Professor Bonney—for whom I entertain the greatest respect—enforces his statement as to the credibility of the earlier books of the Bible by references to the higher critical opinions touching the later books. But unless these be proved facts—and I submit that they are not—it in no way confirms the supposition that the earlier books of the Bible are not worthy of credit. We cannot prove the strength of a statement by appealing to another which is still under discussion, *sub judice lis est.* Professor Bonney did not ascribe blame at all to those who differ from him; but what I would say is this, that it is not fair at all to interpret Genesis by the extravagant utterances of a few persons who ought to be better enlightened on the point. Therefore, in these days of scientific opinion, and of conflict between the opposing forces of science, we who still cling to the historical accuracy and the doctrinal reliability of the Book of Genesis, can sit down and afford to wait.

The Right Rev. the Chairman.

No other cards have been handed up to me, and I think it would be undesirable to talk upon a subject of so much difficulty and importance simply for the purpose of talking. It is clear that nothing should be said upon it except by those who have studied the subject. The various Speakers have each followed their own lines of thought. We must, I think, all feel that we have learned much from what they have said, and that we would prefer to go away and think upon what we have listened to before we pronounce an opinion upon it.

AGRICULTURAL HALL,

WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 9TH, 1895

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair

WORKING-MEN'S MEETING.

TITHES AND ENDOWMENTS

(1) BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

(2) AFTER THE REFORMATION.

ADDRESSES.

The Worshipful P. V. SMITH, M.A., LL.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester; 116, Westbourne Terrace, W.

THERE is a saying of one of our poets that "plain truth needs no flowers of speech," and to-night under the haunting fear of the closing bell I must ask you to excuse me from attempting to indulge in any flights of oratory, and to allow me to state as shortly and as clearly as I can the actual facts respecting the tithes and other religious endowments in this country before the Reformation. Let us consider (1) what they were, (2) to whom they were given, and (3) to whom they now belong.

(1) They consisted chiefly of the tithe—a word which signifies tenth. The practice of devoting a tenth part to the service of God is at least three thousand five hundred years old, for we read of Abraham giving a tithe or a tenth of spoils taken in war to Melchizedek the priest of the Most High God; and it was imposed on the Jews by Divine command. Our Lord, as we know, laid down principles rather than exact laws; but the New Testament teaches us that not one-tenth only, but the whole of our possessions, belong to God, and that we are bound out of them to support His ministers who supply the spiritual wants of our souls. The Christian Church, therefore, early perceived that, as the Christian religion is more blessed than the Jewish, it ought to be supported with at least equal generosity, and its followers ought to give not less than a tithe of their property to its service. And so when our English ancestors were converted to Christianity twelve hundred years ago, the landowners began to devote to Church purposes the tithe, or the tenth part, of the produce of their estates—the tenth sheaf of corn, the tenth cock of hay, the tenth lamb, the tenth goose, the tenth fleece of wool, and so forth. It was a free-will gift in the first instance, but, like other free-will gifts, when once made, it could not be withdrawn. If I were to make to one of you to-day a free gift in proper form of one hundred pounds a year out of my property, I could not recall that gift to-morrow; and if I did not pay the one hundred pounds year by year, the law would compel me to do so. In like manner, after the tithes were given, the law declared that they must be paid, but it did not create them in the first instance any more than it would have created my gift of one hundred pounds a year in the case which I have supposed. You will find that Mr. Asquith himself admitted this in the House of Commons on the 17th of last June. But, besides the tithes, our ancestors before the Reformation made other gifts for Church purposes. There were no stocks or shares or property of that kind in those days. The wealth of the nation consisted almost entirely of land and the cattle and crops which could be reared upon it. And so those other religious endowments in old time consisted of land, which was given at different times, and in larger or smaller quantities, by the kings and other great landowners, usually with terrible curses against anyone who should dare thereafter to take it away from the service of God.

(2) To whom were the tithes and lands given? The landowners, in almost all cases, gave the tithes of their estates to support divine worship in the churches which they built on those estates, and to supply spiritual ministrations for themselves and their tenants and peasantry. Each estate in that way became a parish, and our present old parishes, with their unequal sizes and varying shapes, indicate the domains which were owned by the great proprietors in those early times. But the arrangement for the spiritual care of the parish was not always the same. In some cases the tithes

were given to the parson himself, in which case he was called the rector; but in other cases they were given to some abbey or monastery, perhaps at a considerable distance, and then the body of monks became the rector, and they attended to the parish by deputy or vicariously. This was at first done irregularly and at haphazard, but it was at last arranged almost universally, that when an abbey or monastery was rector, there should be a fixed vicar, who should reside in the parish and perform the proper ministrations, and that he should receive the tithes of the cattle and other less valuable things (which were called "the small tithes"), while the abbey or monastery, as rector, retained the more valuable tithes of corn, hay, wool, and wood (which were called "the great tithes"). There is not the slightest trace that there ever existed in England the three-fold or four-fold division of tithes which prevailed in some parts of the Continent of Europe, under which either one-third or one-fourth of the tithes was given, not to Church purposes, but to the poor. No claim can therefore be made against any part of the tithes on that account, although, if it could, we could reply to it by the fact that, as we shall presently see, the Church at present actually possesses only three-fourths of the tithes of the country. It must be added that, of course, both the great and the small tithes have in modern times been commuted into equivalent annual money payments.

In the gifts of land, which we have next to consider, there was a greater variety. Some of them were made for the benefit of the parish clergy, and in those cases the land was called glebe. But land was also given for the support of particular bishoprics, or of cathedral bodies, or of abbeys or monasteries, or of chantries for the saying of masses for the souls of the dead. In no case, however, was any land, any more than the tithe, actually given to the Church as a whole; although, for the sake of shortness and convenience, we speak of it as Church property, and as belonging to the Church. Both tithes and land were always given to some particular body or functionary of the Church.

(3) Having now seen what endowments were given, and to whom they were given, we come in the last place to the question—To whom do they belong? You will remember that at the Reformation almost all the abbeys, and all the monasteries and chantries, were abolished. Upon their abolition the tithes and lands belonging to the abbeys and monasteries, and the lands belonging to the chantries, were confiscated, not on the ground that these tithes and lands were national property, but on the ground that the institutions which owned them had become useless and worse, and that the property was being applied for the support of idleness, and even of vice. The tithes and lands so confiscated went in part to the foundation of five new bishoprics, in part to the endowment of colleges and schools, and in part into the hands of the Crown, or into private hands. This transaction resulted in just about one-fourth of the whole tithe of the country being taken from the Church, and I should be afraid to say how much land besides. The tithe and land so taken away remain to this day in the possession of the colleges and schools, or in the hands of the Crown, or in private hands, as the case may be; and after a lapse of three hundred and fifty years the Church puts forward no claim to have them restored. But although the Church has possessed the tithe and land which was left to her at the Reformation for the same three hundred and fifty years, and for many centuries before that, yet her assailants now claim that she ought to be deprived of them on the grounds—first, that they are national property; and, secondly, that they were originally given to the Roman Catholic Church, and for the support of Roman Catholic teaching, and therefore the Protestant and Reformed Church of England has no right to them; though, curiously enough, our opponents do not go on to the logical conclusion, that they ought therefore all to be given back to the Roman Catholics. Now instead of swallowing with open mouth all the false claims and assertions of nineteenth century disestablishers, let us go back and see what was actually said and done at the time when the endowments were given. Was it then considered that Church property was national property? On the contrary, Church lands were exempt from certain national duties and taxes to which the other land of the kingdom was subject. Accordingly, between two hundred and three hundred years before the Reformation, Parliament passed a series of Acts, called the Mortmain Laws, to check private individuals from giving land for Church purposes. You may be sure that if land, on being given to the Church, really became the property of the State, the State would no more have tried to stop individuals from giving land to the State than any one of you would try to stop me if I began to stuff sovereigns into your pocket; but it did so because the land, when it came into the hands of the Church, so far from becoming national property, was actually withdrawn from the

service of the nation. But were the endowments given to the Roman Catholic Church? Read again the records of Parliament two hundred years before the Reformation. The popes of those days tried to make out that our Church endowments belonged to the Roman Church, and they issued bulls, and what were called provisions, purporting to assign many of our richest endowments to foreign priests and prelates. So Parliament passed another series of Acts, called the Statutes of Provisors, which declared that the kings and nobles of England had given these endowments for the Holy Church of England, and that any persons who procured any such appointments or provisions from the pope, or treated them as valid, should forfeit all their property and be imprisoned during the king's pleasure.

"Oh! but," say our opponents, "the Church of England was itself Roman Catholic in those days, and the endowments were given to promote Roman Catholic teaching." Indeed! What do they mean by Roman Catholic teaching? It is in part the same as our own; but I suppose they mean those features of it which differ from ours, such as transubstantiation, the withholding of the cup from the laity in the Sacrament, the celibacy of the clergy, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and papal infallibility. Now let us look at dates. The tithes were nearly all given before the year 1000, and the great bulk of the Church lands before 1200. But transubstantiation (for denying which our martyrs died at the stake in Queen Mary's reign) was not made a dogma of the Roman Church till 1215; the celibacy of the clergy was not finally enforced in this country until about the same time; the wine was given to the laity in the Sacrament till some seventy years later; while as for the immaculate conception of the Virgin and papal infallibility, the one was declared in 1854 and the other in 1870, so that according to our opponents our Church endowments were given to support doctrines which were not invented until a period varying between two hundred and eight hundred years after the gifts were made. I think you will agree with me that if our opponents can believe and say that, they can believe and say anything. There was only one set of endowments which were given in connection with distinctly Romish teaching, and those were the gifts to the chantries for masses for the souls of the dead. But you will remember that all these gifts, as well as the endowments of the abbeys and monasteries, were taken from the Church at the Reformation; while the rest of the old endowments which the Church continues to hold were then left untouched. These last were not then transferred to any new Church, nor was any new Church then created. But they were simply not meddled with, and remained the property of that Church which had previously owned them, and which had for many preceding centuries been, and then continued to be, the Church of England. It is true that the religious thoughts and practices of one generation have never in the whole history of Christendom been exactly the same as those of another; but, as regards the property which the Church retained at the Reformation, it may be safely said that if the givers of it could come to life again at the present day, they would find their own religious ideas more nearly represented by the existing Church of England than by any other body of Christians.

Why, then, should this property be taken from the Church? It belongs to the Church by at least as good a title as that by which any other property in this country belongs to its owner, whether that owner be a public body or a private individual. If anyone doubts this, let him bring an action in the Courts of Justice to try the question. In fact the property of the Church can only be taken from her by an Act of Parliament altering its ownership. We know that it has been proposed to do this, and to devote the property to secular or worldly uses on the pretence of religious equality. Such a proceeding would be neither religious nor equal. It would no more be a religious proceeding than it would be a charitable proceeding to take away the property of some great charity and devote it to another public purpose. It would not be an equal or just proceeding, because it would be treating the Church and her property in a way in which it is not proposed to treat any other institution or property in the country. In what other case is it for a moment suggested that we should deprive an institution of property which it is using well, and which is not too great for its needs? So far from too much property being given for the support of religion in this country, all our religious bodies are perpetually asking for more. What folly, then, to take away some of that which is already devoted to the purpose! It rests with the people of England to decide whether they will keep for the religious benefit of themselves and their children those endowments which centuries ago were given for that purpose by their forefathers. As far as they have been asked the question hitherto, they have replied that they will not give up these endowments; and I believe that, if the question is ever put to them more plainly in the time to come,

they will reply with even greater clearness and greater determination, "We will not commit this irreligious, unjust, and foolish act. We will not disendow our National Church."

SYDNEY GEDGE, Esq., M.P., Victoria Street, Westminster.

MR. CHANCELLOR SMITH has told you that about one-fourth of the property of the Church of England before the Reformation was taken from her by the State, and used for the purposes of the State. The one-fourth, he said, principally belonged to the monasteries, which had been the chief supporters of the poor. In those days there was no Poor Law, and those who were old and infirm were in the habit of going to the monasteries and being supported by the charity of the monks. When the property of the monasteries was handed over to the king, or to various great lords whom he decided to reward for their adhesion to his fortunes, the poor did not get the same benefits from the new owners, and the result was a great state of destitution, the relief of which Parliament had to take in hand. At that time they did not approve of strikes, and if there were any able-bodied men who declined to work for such wages as they could get, they flogged them at the cart's tail through the town as sturdy vagabonds. There was then, as there always will be, a considerable number of men and women incapable of maintaining themselves, and therefore it became necessary to pass a Poor Law, which was done in the year 1603. Thus an opportunity was given to the State to consider whether they should give a further endowment or not to the Church of England. Well, they did endow the Church of England by that Poor Law, only it was rather a left-handed endowment. As Chancellor Blofeld pointed out very clearly this morning, while other people were rated for the poor only on a portion of their income, and if those incomes were derived from land were allowed to deduct the expense of earning those incomes, the clergy were treated as if the income they derived from the land came spontaneously into their pockets without their doing anything in return; they were rated on the whole of their income, every shilling. That injustice continues to the present day, not only for the Poor Law, but in respect of rates for highways, lighting, School Board, and all the other pleasant little things which swell the pockets of the rate collector. That is not exactly, you would say, an endowment. I think it right to begin by stating to you that the first Act of the Legislature was not of a beneficial character.

But now for the alleged endowments. When the Crusades were taken in hand by the Christian leaders and kings in Europe, it was very necessary to provide the wherewithal, and the pope, in order that they might obtain money for the Crusade, determined to exact from all the parish clergy throughout Europe the firstfruits—that is to say, the first year's income, and one-tenth of all the after years' incomes. The Crusades passed away, but the exactions continued. The popes had found it very pleasant indeed to get these firstfruits, and to get these tithes of the clergymen's incomes, and although they were no longer needed to support the Crusades, the popes still exacted them for the support of themselves. When the Reformation came, Henry VIII., with a very keen eye for endowments, saw at once how exceedingly wrong it was that an Italian pope should be permitted to take these firstfruits from poor clergy in England, and also to take year by year one-tenth of their incomes; and he very properly put an end to it. These first-fruits and tithes of incomes were very pleasant things to come into his own pocket, and he took them accordingly. This went on for two hundred years, but fortunately Henry VIII. decreed that the value of the first year's income was to be taken account of by the King's Commissioners, and entered in the King's books. That was the amount taken from the clergy for about two hundred years, and that amount did not vary with the rise or fall of the value of money, therefore in the time of Queen Anne the money so obtained from the whole country only amounted to about £16,000 a year, which was only a very small proportion of what the tithes amounted to. Queen Anne, having a tender conscience, did not like the idea that these firstfruits, which belonged to the Church originally, should be confiscated by the State, and she gave them up out of her revenues, and Parliament confirmed it by Act. Considering that every incumbent had taken his living subject to the payment, and that those who had the patronage of the livings knew that this payment was to come from them, Queen Anne naturally thought that instead of returning the money to the particular livings from which it came, it would be better to use it for the general good of the Church. Parliament, therefore, appointed the Queen Anne's Bounty

Commissioners, who were to apply the money for the benefit of the Church in those districts and parishes which most needed assistance. That is the origin of Queen Anne's Bounty. I mention it, because our opponents say that the Bounty is an endowment by the State. But I think you will see it was only a return to the Church of her own property. The money, under the Act of Parliament was administered by the Commissioners, who included bishops and dignitaries of the Church, laymen, and others eminent for their business capacities and skill. The money was employed in augmenting small benefices, and also in the granting of loans at a low rate of interest to the clergy to enable them to build or repair their parsonage houses, which were no longer adapted to modern requirements. Besides this, the fund has been administered so as to raise other money. It has not always been simply given or lent to the clergymen, but whenever a loan has been effected, or an augmentation made, it has been given in such a manner as to call out other subscriptions. Every shilling laid out by Queen Anne's Bounty has produced, perhaps, another shilling out of private property, thus conferring greater benefits upon livings and the parishes in which they existed than would have been obtained if the Commissioners had only given them their own money.

In the early part of this century the nation, in gratitude for having overcome the French and Napoleon Buonaparte, through Parliament voted for eleven years £100,000 a year, making £1,100,000, which was paid over to the Commissioners of Queen Anne's Bounty by way of augmentation of that fund. That money the Church received from the State. I cannot give you the statistics of what has been done by Queen Anne's Bounty since its formation, for that would only weary you; but taking the period from 1880 to 1885, in that time four hundred and ninety-two poor livings were augmented from Queen Anne's Bounty to the amount of £135,800, in return for which they received from private individuals £166,850; so that every shilling the Bounty granted produced another fourteen pence. I ask you, in all fairness, did not the State induce these private individuals to give this £166,000? I ask you, further, whether because it gave £135,000, it has, either on the ground of religion or morality, the right to claim, not only that £135,000, but also the £166,000 which private individuals subscribed? Would not that be the grossest injustice?

I now come to another fund which is said to be an endowment by the nation—that of Church rates. For about three centuries it was the custom in most parishes of England to impose a Church rate for the maintenance of the church and burial-ground. It was done upon the old legal maxim that "seat and sepulture" was the inherent right of every parishioner—a seat in the church, and sepulture in the burial-ground. They all claimed the second; but all did not take advantage of the first. For years Church rates were imposed in this way, and in each parish it was believed that the majority had a right to bind the minority, and that an amendment that no rates should be granted was illegal. That common belief was upset by the decision of the House of Lords in the Braintree case, that it was perfectly lawful for the parishioners to assemble in the vestry, and by a majority determine either that a Church rate should be granted, or to refuse a rate altogether. When that decision was given, Dissenters found that it was not a matter of law they should pass a Church rate, and it was then that they found that it was "an intolerable strain" that they should have to pay these Church rates, while in addition they had to pay for the maintenance of their own chapels. In the result, Parliament, anxious to do what was just, passed a law depriving the majority in the parish of the power to make a compulsory Church rate. From that time there have been no Church rates, and the Nonconformists have been free from the "intolerable strain." At the same time you will remark that the rights of seat and sepulture still remain and are still largely used, though the payment for them has fallen to the ground. That is not a case of very severe endowment of the Church of England. At any rate, whatever it was, the Church rate was made for the common benefit. It has ceased, and therefore there can be no question at the present day of putting an end to that endowment.

I turn to another case in which the Church has received some endowment from the State. About the year 1818, in gratitude for the peace which had succeeded the long wars against Napoleon Buonaparte, the State took into consideration the spiritual wants of some of our very large towns. One of the effects of the war had been a very great increase of towns like Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool, for which no adequate provision had been made with regard to spiritual fabrics in which to worship Almighty God. Parliament voted £1,000,000 for the building of churches, and a few years afterwards it added half a million more. It also gave drawbacks on heavily taxed materials which were being used in the construction of churches for which the £1,000,000 was to pay. These drawbacks amounted to rather less than £300,000 given by the State, making a total of £1,800,000. If you will add to that the

£1,100,000 already mentioned as coming from Queen Anne's Bounty, you arrive at a total of £2,900,000 given to the Church of England out of the taxes. I want you to bear that figure in mind for a reason which will appear presently.* From a Parliamentary return it appears that the churches built at that time out of public money owed their establishment mainly to the contributions of Churchmen, who subscribed five-sixths of the money on the faith of the State grant. I wish that a better style of architecture had been employed in their erection, for a meaner set of churches than those erected with the aid of that public money does not exist, I should think, anywhere on the globe. Would it be fair to the Church of England, whose followers supplemented so largely the State grant, to take away all these churches for secular uses? I think you will agree with me that it would be as unjust as to take the benefactions which were given from Queen Anne's Bounty.

Then it is said that the Church is being endowed day by day in continual augmentations of livings by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, a body which is the creature of the State, and whose acts are therefore the acts of the State. Let us look to the facts. During the short Government of Sir Robert Peel, when he was endeavouring to govern England with a minority in Parliament, until a dissolution came, and gave a large majority on the other side, a commission was appointed to look into Church matters. There were large estates held by archbishops and bishops, and by deans and chapters. It was their custom to grant leases for lives. Somebody came forward to the bishop for a lease of land worth £1,000 a year, and would obtain it for £50 a year, with a payment of £10,000 down. In this way the land would be granted for three lives. The bishop was glad to pocket the £10,000, and parted with the land for a certain number of lives. This was a very wasteful way of dealing with the land. One bishop got a great deal more than he ought, and his successor suffered. The State took matters in hand. Let me, in justice to the bishops and deans and chapters, say that they were very glad that the State should take matters in hand. The State handed over all these properties to the Ecclesiastical Commission, of which bishops and laymen are members. The commissioners had out of the rents to pay proper incomes to the archbishops and bishops. A number of canonries were cut down, and for the services in the cathedrals a proper income was given to the deans, canons, and members of the chapter.

It was known that many of the estates in towns would increase in value, and produce larger incomes. Parliament, therefore, decreed that when the incomes of the archbishops and bishops, etc., were provided for, the surplus resulting from increment should be applied to the augmentation of livings. The districts where the property was situated, of course, had the first claim, and next the parishes throughout the country containing a population of four thousand and upwards. From time immemorial the State has acted on the principle that funds bequeathed for charitable uses should be administered as nearly as possible in accordance with the wishes of the founder. That was called the *Cypres* doctrine, which is this—that when it is no longer possible to apply the money to the original purposes of the founder, it should be applied as nearly as possible to those wishes. The State applied that principle to those estates vested in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. It knew that the founders would not wish that the Archbishop of Canterbury should have £200,000 a year, simply because the estate which formed the endowment of his see had become valuable for building purposes. It was therefore decided that he should have an income sufficient for his position, the remainder of the money to be applied in a manner similar to that desired by the original founder, viz., for the spiritual benefit of those in the land who required Christian instruction. Again, whenever the Ecclesiastical Commissioners made a grant, it was generally done in such a way as to produce a similar amount from Churchmen in private contributions. One hundred thousand pounds given in a diocese by grant of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in this way produces another £100,000 from the pockets of benevolent Churchmen. Would it be just that the State should take the whole £200,000, and say—We contributed £100,000, and therefore we will take the whole £200,000, notwithstanding it was our grant which induced you to subscribe half the money out of your own pockets? From 1840 to the year 1886, the amounts obtained from the private pockets of Churchmen in this way amounted to no less than four and a half millions; and of the five thousand three hundred benefices which have had their incomes increased, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have provided £739,000 a year, and

---

Time did not permit Mr. Gedge to mention that Nonconformists have received from the State a larger sum than this.

private benefactors have provided £151,000 a year. I hope you understand, however, that not a shilling of the whole of the money comes out of the pocket of the State. All the State did was to apply the *Cypres* doctrine to regulate the manner in which the money of the Church should be applied. The State has given nothing beyond that £1,100,000 for the building of Churches.

The Lord Chancellor's livings are another small point on which our opponents attack the Church. It was in 1864 that Lord Chancellor Westbury, finding that a very considerable number of livings in his gift were so small that it was almost impossible to find anyone to take them save men of fortune, conceived the very excellent idea of selling the advowsons, and applying the purchase money to the augmentation of the livings. I concede that the State did give up the Lord Chancellor's right of patronage, but I do not think anyone would claim that we should refund to the State such an endowment as that.

My time is nearly up. I want to say a word or two about private endowments. If you look at the Parliamentary return, you may at first be astonished to find how small, comparatively, is the amount of private endowments since the Reformation in comparison with the endowments by our forefathers centuries ago. But you must remember this, that for two hundred years after the Reformation there was really no need for further endowment. The population was not increasing so fast, and there was no need for it. It was not until the nineteenth century that the need was felt by the increase of population in our manufacturing towns. During the previous two hundred years, I am afraid the Church of England was very dull and cold. Dryden says of her, at the end of the eighteenth century,

> "From her no sound to foreign lands has come,
> Humbly content to be despised at home."

But thank God the Church has awakened to her responsibility, both at home and abroad. During the last fifty years, something like £50,000,000 has been found for the building and repairing of churches, and in that time another £25,000,000 has been found for the establishment of Church Schools—£75,000,000 as endowments in fifty years. Is that all to cease? It will cease, if the State is going to seize these private endowments. Sir George Jessel, late Master of the Rolls, walking up and down with me on Dover Cliff, tried to persuade me into the belief that because the Church is national, the State, if anyone gives it an endowment of £1,000, has the right to seize that £1,000 to-morrow. If such a doctrine were true, there would be an end of such endowments as that, I hear, lately given by Mrs. Fraser, of £100,000 for the augmentation of poor benefices in the populous diocese of Manchester. If that doctrine is to be preached, all confidence will cease.

Mr. Picton, the radical member for Leicester, said in the House of Commons that it was impossible to rob God; because everything belonged to God. We might rob each other, but we could not rob God, and therefore the State had the right to take the revenues of the Church. It fell to me to reply to him, and I said, "God has put and God answered that question in Malachi, thus, 'Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed Thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse.'" I hope I have shown you that the Church has the same title to her property that is possessed by any owner of private property. Besides, the State has made laws and regulations administering the Church's property according to the purposes of the original founders. I hope, also, that you are satisfied that the Church is doing a good work; that you are determined to maintain it, and that you will not allow it to be robbed.

W. Mason, Esq.

I PROPOSE to speak to you to-night about tithes, and to give you a few reasons which commend themselves to me in my sincere conviction that no tithe has ever been given by the nation, whether through Parliament or otherwise. The first of these reasons is this. No law has ever been produced supposed to have this effect. Some of the laws are spurious; some of them enforce tithe which did not give it. It was necessary in the beginning to enforce tithes. A man who owned land gave tithes of the produce of his land. The time came, after his death, when his son, or grandson, or great-grandson, standing in his shoes, refused to pay. The Church enforced payment from him, and the State was required to set the machinery in

motion. The State, first of all, said, "You may leave, if you like, one-tenth of the produce of your land to the Church." That was a very different thing from the original grant of a right to the Church. No ancient Act has ever been yet produced which has done more than that. Until some Act has been brought before me which proves that tithe was given in early days by the State, I shall refuse to believe it.

Secondly, I do not know, and have never found anyone who could explain, where the power lay to pass such an Act. Who passed those laws of ancient days? It was not a Parliament such as we know at the present day. Of course it was not the Wytenagemote, which consisted of forty, fifty, or seventy men. There was the king at the head of it. There were the bishops and the great men of the land—such of them as chose to attend the earliest of assemblies. These men were not the representatives of the nation for the purposes of taxation. They assembled for the purpose of taking counsel and passing laws, but they were not armed with any powers of taxation. How was it possible for such an assembly, meeting in the South of England, to wring from unwilling landlords, great or small, payments of tithe in Northumbria, or North as far as Edinburgh? It seems to me absolutely absurd that any law passed by an assembly of that kind could possibly have wrung tithes from an unwilling landlord.

Thirdly, if there had been a law of that kind, would it not have told the tithe-payer the kind of property which was to pay tithe? That no such law was passed is evident from the fact that the payment of tithe varied inconceivably in different parishes. In one parish it would be on corn or hay, or perhaps the young of animals. In another, the landowner would give it on a tenth of his flour or multure taken by him for grinding at his mill the corn of his tenants. He might give the tenth of the fish taken in his rivers, or a tenth of the venison, or wild deer, killed in his own domain. Instead of being one uniform gift throughout the country, it varied in every parish. When we come to the first Act of Parliament which deals with tithes, passed in the reign of Henry VIII. to enforce the payment of tithes (which, when transferred from the monasteries to laymen, were not so readily paid as before), this Act did not declare on which articles tithe was to be paid, but that tithe must be paid according to the good and laudable customs of each parish. It is a mistake to suppose that a landlord granted a tenth of all the produce of his land, but he gave a tenth of some particular article of produce. If a millionaire gave you a tenth of all the guineas of his balance at the bankers', you would, no doubt, be very grateful; but if he only gave you a tenth of the odd shillings, your gratitude would be considerably modified. So it was in regard to tithe; it was given, not on all, but on some particular article of produce.

Once more, if this tithe had been given by any Act of Parliament, would it not have said to what person, to what corporation, this tithe was to be paid? We know perfectly well that, so far from its being the case in ancient days that the landowner was bound to pay his tithe to a particular person or corporation, he paid it to whomsoever he pleased, so long as it came to the Church. The landowner was not bound to pay the tithe to his own parish priest; on the contrary, he took them from him and gave them to some monastery of the parish. Not only the gift, but the person to whom it was made, varied in a very large degree. One man might give his tithe to the parish priest, and another might give it partly to his parish priest and partly to a monastery; a third might give it wholly to a monastery, or his bishop, or the dean and chapter of the cathedral. Beyond doubt, tithe never could have been given by any law, because, if it had been, there would have been uniformity, and not diversity.

Some people say, "Shew us your title-deeds." They seem to forget that in those days—a thousand years ago—there were such things as damp, and moths, and worms; and they seem to think that everybody and every church kept their documents in a Milner's fire-resisting safe. But we are not able to produce those deeds, for the simple reason that they never existed. In old days the legal way was to make over property in the presence of witnesses. I am not speaking of Church property, but all property. When a man wanted to make over a house or land to another, he called his neighbours together, and he dug up a sod from the soil, or clipped a twig from a tree, to show that he made over the land to him to whom he granted it. That was the proper way of making over property—without ink or paper being used at all. It seems to me rather hard, therefore, that we are told that our property is to be taken away from us because we cannot produce title-deeds which never had any existence at all.

But though there were, undoubtedly, extremely few charters, or grants, or deeds of gift

in ancient days, yet, if we could find but one, would it not prove our case? It would show that Parliament or the State never did grant this tithe. Such a charter I will now read to you. It is a grant of tithes in a parish on the borderlands of England and Wales. It was in the reign of Henry I., and runs thus:—"Bernard, by the grace of God Bp. of St. David's, to all the faithful of the Holy Ch: of God greet[g] & benedict[n]. Let all, both those who are now liv[g] and those who shall hereafter live, know that when we consecrated the Ch: of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Haye, William Revel did, by permiss[n] of Bernard Newmarch, who was present at the consecrat[n], give & grant, as a free gift & endowm[t] of the Church itself, 15 acres of land & 2 tenements, & all the land attached to those tenements in the high forest land as far as the boundaries of Ewias, & in the coppice, & in the low ground. He gave also to the same Church all the tithe of all his estate of Haye in all things, as well as that of the lands of Ivor & Meleniac, & of all things that are held of the lordship of Haye. And that no question may arise in the future respecting the matter, he definitely gave tithe as follows:—of corn, & hay, & poultry, & cattle, & sheep, & pigs, & wood, & cheese, & underwood, & the benevolence of Welshmen, & tolls for right of passage, & fees for plaints. Whoever shall subtract or diminish aught from these, let him be cut off from the communion of God & His Saints until he come to a better mind. Fare ye well."

Now, will you tell me kindly, how it was possible for the State to give these tithes to Haye, and yet William Revel did give them afterwards a second time. Now, there lived in this county (Norfolk), at a period some sixty or seventy years after the Reformation, a very learned man, Sir Henry Spillman. He lived in the West of Norfolk, and he held some land which once belonged to the Church. There occurred about this land a lawsuit, which Sir Henry Spillman won, though at so expensive a cost, and with such complication and difficulty, as caused him to think there must be something curious about it. It led him to consider the position of land which had once been consecrated to the Church. He looked about him and saw what had happened to the possessors of Church land in his own neighbourhood. He drew a circle round his own residence, with a diameter of twenty-four miles, and which comprised twenty-four houses belonging to country gentlemen, who had been seated there a long time, and also twenty-four old monastery houses. At the time at which he wrote—1615—there had elapsed from the abolition of the monasteries some seventy years. In that period not one of the houses belonging to the country gentlemen had changed hands, its name, or family. But of the twenty-four monastery houses not one had preserved its original inhabitants. All, save two, had "cast forth," as Sir Henry Spillman says, "its possessors." In some cases the property had changed hands four, five, and even six times, in the course of the seventy years, and often that change of hands had occurred under the most melancholy, unfortunate, and cruel circumstances. This induced Sir Henry Spillman to inquire into the subject of sacrilege. He wrote a book on the history of sacrilege, and this book had a very great effect throughout the whole of England. Men who had been possessed of Church land or tithes came forward and gave them back again to the Church, and on the authority of a man who has investigated the subject, I may state that no less than £1,000,000 of tithes have been restored to the Church since the Reformation. That, I take it, is not a gift of the State. As an illustration of this restoration, I will refer to the gift of tithe to Slebech, Pembrokeshire, A.D. 1640, a few years after Sir Henry Spillman published his book. The deed runs thus:—

"I, George Barlow, of Slebech, finding it an ancient institution of primitive times to make, consecrate, and endow vicarages with tithes, the patrons reserving power to themselves of presentment, and holding it also unjust and a principle in conscience not to perform the same accordingly, do make a perpetual vicarage endowed with cure of souls in Slebech, presentative by me and my heirs. I do also freely give and for ever grant unto the said Parish Church of Slebech and Vicars the house lately by me to that purpose built and lands thereto belonging near the churchyard, together with all tithes within the parish of Slebech, township of Priston, and Millhill in the parish of Boulton, except Sheaffe, and all manner of tithes, of what nature and kind soever issuing within the demesne lands of Slebech now in my tenure and occupation. If any shall take away from the Holy Church of God the premises in part or in all so by me given (which I hope no man ever will) let his account be without mercy at the dreadful Day of Judgment, when he shall come to receive his doom at the hands of the Judge of heaven and earth to whom I dedicate the same."

Both William Revel and George Barlow declare that these tithes are gifts, not for the State, but are consecrated to the service of God. When William Revel went to the Church of Haye, he laid on the altar that deed, or, if not that deed, he took

the horns of a beast or the wool of a sheep, or a lock of his own hair; something or other to lay on the altar to show the people present that his gift was not to the State, but distinctly to the service of God. I say that no man can take away that gift so long as the Church is doing her duty, so long as the gift is not being wasted, but is being applied to the purposes for which it is given. To take away that gift would be, if not sacrilege, at any rate plunder and unjustifiable robbery.

The Rev. H. HENSLEY HENSON, Vicar of Barking, Essex.

I PROPOSE to address you rather from the point of view which it seems to me the clergyman must have in mind when he turns his thoughts to the subject of Church property, and the burdens to which it is subjected by the State. I apprehend no man can attack or defend Church property unless he can honestly say he is convinced that the policy which he advocates had in view the interests of religion, and therefore the interests of the English people. I put on one side to-night, if there be such, those to whom the interests of religion are not precious, though they may have their place in a composite movement which makes for disendowment. I prefer to address myself to the great majority who are both the attacking and defending parties on this question, and who take it for granted that the disendowment or the maintenance of the Church is in the interest of religion, and therefore in the highest interests of the English people. One is amazed at the widely extended ignorance which exists of the elementary facts of the discussion.

We are continually being told that Church property is of great and excessive amount. That idea was urged in some of the most characteristic and impassioned utterances of the Welsh members of the late Parliament. It is an idea which is very extensively spread among my good friends, the working-men in this country. I ask you to believe that there is no reality in this talk about the excessive wealth of the Church, which is so common and so mischievous. The Liberation Society, with an industry which would be creditable if the cause were better, spreads abroad statistics which are extremely interesting, but which, like most interesting statistics, are almost entirely without foundation. It assures the working-men of this country that if they can persuade Parliament to lay hands on the revenue of the Church of England, that a fund of about £7,000,000 would be at the disposal of the State for whatever services the popular will might suggest it should be applied to. The entire value of the tithes at par in 1883, as reported to Parliament by the Land Commissioners, amounted to £4,053,985 6s. 8½d.; but not all that belongs to the Church. Of that sum, £962,289 15s. 7¼d. belongs to laymen and to colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, which we may here rank as laymen.

Church tithe at par only produces £3,091,695 11s. 1¼d.; but we clergymen who happen to have the misfortune to be tithe owners know that tithe is not at par, and only realizes seventy-four per cent., so that for every £100 a clergyman is supposed to get, he in reality only gets £74, which brings the gross annual value of tithes belonging to the Church down to £2,288,850. But that is not all. The taxes and rates on tithes are on a very high and exceptional scale. I shall be well within the mark if I deduct twenty per cent. from the seventy-four per cent. off tithe in order to get at the real value of that tithe. So I bring out the value of Church tithe as £1,830,280, which is considerably less than £2,000,000, instead of the grand figures which the Liberation Society suggests to you. That is one example of exaggeration. May I give you another? In the course of conversation with a guest at the dinner of a city company, he said to me that the Church's money was badly distributed; the bishops had such enormous emoluments. He said, "The Bishop of S. Albans, I do not suppose he gets less than £10,000." I replied, "I am able to tell you that the Bishop of S. Albans gets little more than £3,000, that he has no palace, and that out of that sum he has to pay the most formidable legal expenses for doing his duty." In a recent case of considerable difficulty he had to pay costs to no less an amount than £1,600. Therefore, your bishops not only have to look after the diocese and see that hundreds of clergy do their duty, but also have to pay the legal expenses of putting the law in operation against those who do not do their duty. In justice, therefore, you cannot say that incomes of three, four, or five thousand pounds a year will be found in actual working to be excessive.

In fact, anyone who is acquainted with the working of the Church of England to-day, knows that from the Archbishop down to the Bishop of Sodor and Man, there is scarcely a bishop who can afford to hold his high position without drawing very heavily on

private resources of his own. What is the value of these Church endowments to the people of England, and to the great purposes of religion? If I did not believe that the retention of these endowments materially assisted the work of the Church, I for one would not venture to say one word in the defence of their preservation. I believe there is no honest member of the Church of England who would not cheerfully renounce these endowments, if he thought that by so doing he could benefit the sacred interests of religion which the Church of England in God's Providence has to serve. I say that in order to get rid of the base taunt that a clergyman who defends the endowments of religion, of which he is for the moment trustee, is a vulgar self-seeker snatching the loaves and fishes, and with no higher ambition in his mind at all. I take it, then, that when we look at the matter on its merits, there are three great services which the possession of these endowments renders to the Church of England in the fulfilment of her sacred task of ministering to the spiritual needs of the people of England. Humanly speaking, if these endowments were withdrawn, there is no probability that these great interests could be so well served. I say that the endowments of the Church of England are the greatest force in this country which makes for religious equality. This is a catch phrase, which, like most catch phrases, has the great misfortune of being used by people who have never paused to ask what it means.

Religious equality does not mean that all forms and varieties of religion can be reduced to a common level. You may try for ever, but you cannot do it. You cannot make a great, venerable, and historical Church like the Church of England, equal to a trumpery sect evolved from some individual's imagination. If religious equality is to have any valid meaning commending it to intelligent men, it cannot mean less than this: that all citizens shall have equal access to all religious advantages and religious privileges. Can you go to that extent? There is this great difficulty? We are living in a society where there are the widest and most formidable differences in social rank. It has been my fortune for years past to live in the poorer districts of London. One of the most far-reaching difficulties to be encountered is this wide difference in social rank, with consequent inequalites of comfort and enjoyment. But the endowments of the Church enable us to bring to the door of the very poorest, as well as to the door of the very richest in this country, the ministrations of religion, which are not stinted and starved and cut down too much to match the squalid requirements of the simple and uneducated. The poorest man, no less than the richest, must have the Gospel, the whole Gospel, and that you can only give by securing Christ's own Church to minister it. If you withdraw the endowment, and substitute what you absurdly call a voluntary system, you do this. You say, "We will have just the same inequality in the sphere of religion as we have in the sphere of social advantage, comfort, and enjoyment." Is that anything which can commend itself to the acceptance of working-men? I trow not. I trow that the voluntary system means that the man with the large surplus income will get what he wants easily, while the man with no surplus income, who toils hard for small weekly earnings which are uncertain, runs the risk of being defrauded of the provision which his ancestors intended he should have, and which the Church with its endowments is willing to give him.

These endowments, apart from voluntary and occasional gifts, bring within the reach of every citizen, rich and poor, the equal ministration of religion, and they ought to commend themselves before all things to working-men, who have not large surplus incomes to enable them to get what they want. Endowments give permanence to religious provision. The populations of districts fluctuate, and where to-day there are factories and masses of people, there may later be found rows of empty houses. The result is this. If you have a voluntary system, in a perhaps flourishing neighbourhood, then that voluntary system perhaps flourishes; but when what the Americans call the boom has boomed itself out, then the voluntary system suffers. That happens in America continually, and we have the leaders there desiring an endowed system. In district after district in America there have been flourishing churches where now there is neither church or school. Why? Simply because there is no religious endowment, everything depending on the hand to mouth system. When the people could not continue their subscriptions, there was no reserve fund with which to tide over bad times, and the whole system vanished and broke down. Working people, who suffer most by fluctuations in trade and commerce, are the people who benefit most by a permanent religious provision. Therefore, I submit to you that on this account endowments are in their interests, and ought to be retained by the Church. The possession of these endowments is of wonderful assistance to the clergyman in the performance of his duties. They relieve his mind from sordid considerations as to income, which would distract him, and which would make him unable to minister effectively to

his people. They also go a very long way in what I consider a much more important thing—they make the clergyman an independent man.

Far be it for me to say one word against those people who have not that sort of security for independence. It is a great principle of democrats that they who pay the piper should call the tune. If persons are continually putting their hands in their pockets for the support of their ministers, it is natural that they should desire to call the tune. Jesus Christ never authorized the people to call the tune, He gave to them the great revealed truth. The Gospel is a tune which never can be safely called in any democratic way, and can only be safely and thoughtfully delivered by somebody who is independent of any kind of reliance upon the tune-calling power of the people. Have the people of England in their highest spiritual interests anything to gain by the disendowment of the Church of England? Working people have been my neighbours for years. I love them, and I believe in them. They are the people of all people who have the greatest interest in religious equality. They are the people of all people who are most painfully and harshly affected by sudden changes of trade and commerce, which under the voluntary system may deprive them altogether of spiritual privileges. They, beyond any, are the persons who require some security that the Gospel which is delivered to them shall be no mere theory propounded to meet the fashions of the hour, dictated by the financial needs of an oppressed and bankrupt Church, but the Gospel of the Living God which Jesus Christ gave, and gave only to His Church to deliver.

S. ANDREW'S HALL.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 9TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LICHFIELD in the Chair.

DUTY OF THE CHURCH—

(1) TO SAILORS AND FISHERMEN.

(2) TO SOLDIERS.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

BEFORE proceeding to the business of the meeting, I wish to inform the members that the name of Col. Barrington Foote appeared on the older programme, but that he is unable to attend, and the Rev. J. Wilson Pickance will take his place. I have also received a letter from the Rev. Dr. Edghill, Chaplain-General, who was announced to speak, stating that he will be unable to be here. We must all regret his absence. Four or five gentlemen have sent in their names requesting to be heard after the selected Readers and Speakers have finished, but I had better inform them, to prevent disappointment, that even with the omission of Dr. Edghill's name, the time allotted for Speakers will probably fully occupy the two hours which it is arranged that this meeting shall occupy. If I am unable to call upon them to address the meeting therefore, they will understand the cause. I will now call upon Canon Scarth, who is well known in connection with S. Andrew's Waterside Mission, to read his paper.

The Rev. JOHN SCARTH, Vicar of Bearsted, Kent; Hon. Canon of Rochester; Hon. Secretary S. Andrew's Waterside Church Mission.

WHEN Church work among seamen was discussed at the Church Congress at Liverpool twenty-six years ago, the first speaker was Earl Nelson—a name that is specially dear in Norfolk. His first words were, "I do not suppose there is any class whose example for good or evil can have a larger influence on the great work of extending the kingdom of our Blessed Lord on earth than that of the sailors and merchant seamen of Great Britain." Now, with a greatly increased commerce, the statement still holds good.

At that, and at other Congresses, the same subject has been brought forward, but the excellent advice given by eminent Churchmen has unfortunately not been followed as fully as it ought to have been, especially in regard to the way in which the Church can best fulfil her duty to sailors. The value of Church Congresses therefore is depreciated, and we are put on our mettle to-night to press the duty of the Church, if possible, more strongly, in order that that duty may be more perfectly fulfilled towards men without whom, neither England's great influence as a nation, nor her world-wide commerce could exist. I venture to speak, because I have had some experience in trying, with others, to help the Church in this work. There still remains a great deal to be done. The Church is not incapable, but the wider the range of her work extends, the more difficulties must arise, and more faith is needed to overcome them. It has been proved that by the direct work of the responsible clergy, sea-faring men can be ministered to with success at home and abroad, in port and at sea. Indeed, no class has improved in character religiously and socially since the parochial clergy began to take up this work more than the class whose highest welfare we are met here to promote and foster. I would give all honour to all missionaries who have laboured in this cause and for that end, whether they have worked as members of the Church of England, or independently on their own lines. Nonconformists have been diligent in the work and friendly to the parochial clergy engaged in it, there has been most difficulty with those irresponsible committees of Churchmen who seem to wish to have a local or general monopoly of their own.

The Church has a work to do to all. This is not a question that depends upon money. It concerns faith, sympathy, and brotherly love. In a country with a commerce that is now worth £1,000,000,000 a year, all carried by sailors, the cost of the Church doing her duty to them need not be a subject for anxiety if that duty is rightly done. The estimated cost of one of our great battleships would provide all that is needed by the Church for the next thirty years. There are two kinds of supremacy at sea! I appeal to this Congress, and through it to the whole Anglican Church, to accept the Apostolic principle in its grandest scale. "All things were created to the intent that through the Church the manifold wisdom of God should be made known to all powers and principalities in heavenly places." This is S. Paul's inspired way of looking upon our Lord's world-wide commission. We are but poor creatures, but with faith in God, the Church's work may be so exalted as to be a spectacle unto the world, unto angels, and unto men. Let

the Church fulfil her duty, and she will help to celestialize the face of the earth, and glorify the Almighty among those men who now go from port to port, in great oceans of which the Church knew nothing in the days of S. Paul. The new dispensation was a mystery then, but now we know clearly enough what is the Church's duty at home in our ports, our docks, our roadsteads, and our harbours. And as now our sailors go everywhere, and fishermen have to toil away for weeks together at sea, while the fish they catch is sent home by steam, so the Church's duty expands.

The seaman on an "ocean tramp" scarcely knows what his voyage will be, where he will go, or when he will return. He may have to shiver in Antarctic cold or swelter with a shipload of Mohammedan pilgrims in the Red sea, or have to carry petroleum or other explosives at the daily risk of his life. For sanitary reasons the Indian Government, in concert with Turkey, is legislating now to regulate the safety of the pilgrims; but who is caring for the English sailors who have to carry them? It is a large and increasing trade. We may get correct statistics from India, but what do we know of the loss of life in British ships from Persian, Turkish, or African ports? I know of instances where the Moslem pilgrims who died on board were at first quietly and reverently buried, while the crowded steamer was stopped; but as mortality increased the sailors had to go below every morning, drag out the dead to heave overboard as they would cinders, while the steamer was rushing along! British ship owners make money by facilitating the religious peculiarities of the Moslem, yet some care too little for the souls of their own countrymen whom they send to do this work. It is not a new trade. I mention these facts to show how the extension of our commerce opens up new work for our sailors in a way that concerns a national and religious responsibility; but who is responsible, the Government or the Church?

While we profess to protect Egypt, there is in that country the greatest Mohammedan missionary college in the world. Our ships and sailors bring students to be educated there as teachers of the Moslem religion, and take them back to disseminate among people whose language they already know, that religion which Christian missionaries find the most difficult to contend with. There is work to be done by the Church in distant seas as well as on the lakes of Central Africa, where martyrs multiply in the holiest cause. Some of the right reverend bishops beyond our own country face the work among sailors bravely in both heathen and Christian lands, but they need far more sympathy from the Church at home; yet our bishops at home who now know what can be done by the responsible clergy are most kind in their encouragement. The Bishop of Gibraltar has the episcopal charge of our sailors in more ports than any other prelate. He manages to help the chaplains at almost every port between Lisbon and Odessa, chiefly by combination among the chaplains at the health resorts on the beautiful Riviera, who interest the English residents there in this wide-spread work, which is provided for at very little cost and with hearty good will. The example in that straggling diocese is open to all others, and deserves general admiration and regard.

The Church's duty to all classes is to give them their due. If any class

needs more particular attention, surely it is that which is most separated from Church privileges, and which is sent out to mix with all the various nations of the earth. The Church's duty is to meet the sailors and minister to them wherever it can be done. Those who have to do the work know best what help is needed, and how greatly it is appreciated when done. My brother clergy will agree with me, I daresay, that in Ruridecanal Chapters, Diocesan Conferences, and Church Congresses, the subjects that have been brought before them have rarely included this most important one, viz., "How we can best help one another in the fulfilment of any special local duty that ought to be done."

The cry for unity is at present in the air, but we have to learn that the brotherly value of parochial and diocesan combination has to be practised thoroughly amongst ourselves in a Christ-like spirit, before we can hope to see in all its beautiful simplicity Catholic union in the Church. Of course much depends upon the disinterested and unselfish loyalty of all concerned, and dutiful deference to Episcopal authority and recognized Church principles. By experience it has been found that active co-operative and helpful combinations may be local, diocesan, or even general. The grand point in each case is to aid, where need be, the responsible clergy themselves to carry out their own responsibilities. Changes and difficulties have to be met and watched with care. Sailors and ships and most waterside parishes have wonderfully changed. Improvements are visible in nearly all, and such a great advance in the fulfilment of the Church's duty has taken place that we may well give thanks to God.

The parochial clergy need not much mind when their work is ignored by the managers of independent and irresponsible agencies that think of no other work than their own.

It was suggested at the Church Congress at Manchester that professedly Church Seamen's Societies should amalgamate; but surely combination among the parochial and responsible clergy is more practicable than their uniting with societies that publicly ignore their work, and, instead of helping them to do more, try to take it out of their hands.

As one who knows the value of that kind of combination which enables us to "bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ," I humbly venture to state that one of the greatest hindrances to the Church fulfilling her duty to many others, as well as to sailors and fishermen, is found when the partisan power of a peculiar clique is dreaded by ecclesiastical or political authorities who have not the courage to be independent of it. This tends to dishearten the very men who are trying to fulfil, in all its sympathetic fulness, the Church's manifest duty. This injustice comes with double force when undenominational or sectarian societies have Episcopal patronage and support. The public are misled, for the good intentions of a bishop may influence the support of many who know less than himself about what the clergy, perhaps of a different diocese, are trying to do. There might even be more combination among the bishops in regard to getting better done this special work, which neither the bishops nor the clergy have the right to delegate to irresponsible societies that appoint their own agents and work in their own way, independently of Episcopal control. It has been said that there is nothing which Englishmen

appreciate so much as the fulfilment of duty; but it is for the benefit of our countrymen—not merely for their approval—the Church has a duty to fulfil.

We need not point to any particular place where the duty has to be done, for our seafaring people are all over the world. The Church already has organization; what is most needed now is, that we all combine. The isolation of parishes is intended to promote the fulfilment of individual clerical work, but not to dissociate individual clergy from the world-wide responsibility of the Church. How could a voyage be safely accomplished without discipline and co-operation on board? We want more co-operation among the clergy. It is this that has to be encouraged—not an indefinite union, without definite doctrine, but distinct and intelligent teaching, that will help men to strengthen and support one another, even at sea.

In every vessel under the British flag, that very flag has in one corner a singular combination. There are the crosses of S. George, S. Patrick, and S. Andrew. I have been associated with mission work among sailors for the best years of my life. We took the cross of S. Andrew as our flag because he was the first Apostle, and brought his brother to Christ. He was a fisherman, but upon a very little sea. If once the Church would take up the work, and encourage the clergy to join together to help each other to get more done for our sailors, in the Church's way, all over the world, the work I have advocated would be done.*

The Royal Navy has a Church flag of its own. It is always flying when there is service on board any one of Her Majesty's ships. There is a combination among many of the chaplains, officers, and men of the R.N., and their friends, to strengthen the work of the Church. This Royal Naval Church Society sets a good example to the Mercantile Marine, yet in that service much work is now being done for God's glory in many different ways, of which others will have something to say. The principle that I contend for is that the Church *can* fulfil her duty to sailors and fishermen by means of the clergy who are under authority and control. There will always be rival associations, under their respective flags, until the Church has learned the power she has received, and which can be made manifest by the fuller exercise of brotherly love. If we have to fight, let it be for peace. Let the British flag be honoured in every sea, because the men who sail under it are, by God's grace, able to conquer themselves, and are endeavouring to help the Church better to fulfil the Divine commission that she holds. This would be the best victory of all.

The Church's duty to fishermen is being better carried out each year in different dioceses, as the duty becomes better understood. Noble gifts of churches, mission ships, and money have come to various fishing ports. The clergy have gone out for weeks together with the fishermen in their smacks. Brixham took the lead, years ago, even in the North Sea. Grimsby and Gorleston have come bravely to the front, and with diocesan and general support good work may be done. There is a whole diocese of fishermen in Newfoundland, perhaps the poorest of all our dioceses; yet the fishermen there help to build their own churches,

---

* S. Andrew's Waterside Church Mission, 65, Fenchurch Street, London, E.C.

sometimes giving up weeks of labour to the work. The bishop and some of the clergy follow the men even to Labrador. What a pleasure it has been to send them the different kinds of help that they need! But there is one parish in England that for many years has shown a splendid example of the fulfilment of the Church's duty. The vicar has two churches, is beloved by the fishermen, and has even followed them to sea into foreign ports. All round his parish church inside is a beautiful dado of encaustic tiles, each with the name of a member of his flock who has been lost out at sea, where there can be no gravestones; but the names of the men and of their ships are recorded within their parish church. The second row of tiles is begun. The church tower is very high, and can be seen from the sea; and when the fishermen see a light in the tower on a stormy night, they can the more hopefully ride out the gale, because they know that their Vicar at Brightlingsea, who has lighted the lamp to cheer and to guide them, is praying in his church for those who are at sea.

Last year I went round nearly all the coast of Great Britain in a Church-ship ("Goshawk"). She met with the most cordial welcome at every fishing port that she visited. The fishermen at Grimsby and Gorleston crowded her within and without. But perhaps the most cheering visit we had was one from the Bishop of Aberdeen, who longs to see the Church fulfilling her duty, especially among the great herring fleets, that gather from the ocean that one of God's bountiful gifts that is so helpful for the poor. The "Goshawk" was with the North Sea fleets for four months.

There is no limit to the good the Church can do, but the duty to be done must be known. Everyone can help by gifts of reading for the crews, and some can help by money for the work, or by legacies for the cause. Shipowners have been encouraging by carrying the supplies of books free to all parts of the world. But both captains and seamen can be most helpful themselves, for in visiting a ship my rule was never to leave it until I had enlisted at least one man on board to do some work for God among his companions during the voyage; and with the gifts of books that we had received, we were able to help them with the tangible materials that would assist them in the mission work they might do.

The Ven. C. M. Woosnam, Vicar of Dunham Massey; and Archdeacon of Macclesfield.

It will be difficult to find in any part of the Master's vineyard such a wonderful development and growth as that of the Church's work amongst the seamen of our merchant service during the last twenty-five to thirty years.

It was the most exceptional thing to see a *bonâ-fide* sailor from a merchant ship in church—or more exceptional still to see one at the holy table—some twenty years ago. But now we can go to any large port in England, and very many abroad, and find in the seamen's church seat after seat occupied by men who have come straight from sea; and at the weekly celebrations of the Holy Communion in many such ports a band of true Churchmen will be found as earnest communicants, reverently and gladly coming to the Holy Communion.

In twenty-one of the seamen's churches connected with the Missions to Seamen Society, last year over four thousand seven hundred seamen communicated. The reasons for this change, in my opinion, have been that the peculiarities of the sailor's character have been studied; that his special temptations, difficulties, trials, and hindrances have been taken into consideration, and the Church has paid a special attention to the seamen, as a class, through her special agencies. And to do this thoroughly and satisfactorily, special men with special qualifications have been found to give their whole time and attention to this most special work—men who have a love for the sailor, and who identify themselves with him in daily life, and who become his true friends. Then again, seamen have come, as experience now shows in so many ports, to the seamen's church, in which he is able to feel the more comfortable and homely all amongst his shipmates and friends, where the services are hearty and bright, and where he can worship with the same reverence and decency as in the most ornate parish church, using the same liturgy, but with this most valuable assistance, that during the service the pages of the Prayer-book will be announced for the convenience of those who may, by disuse, have a difficulty in finding their way to the many parts of the service—and this very important detail adds a heartiness and simplicity to the service. But while advocating the special church for the seamen, I would not for one moment wish to imply that it should not be a well-furnished and nicely adorned church, and equipped with all that may tend towards a reverent and decorous worship.

I am fully alive also to the fact that there are a few like the reader of the last paper who whould prefer to bring the sailor to the parish church, and to make this branch of the Church's work a branch of the parochial work; but I cannot shut my eyes to the now well-tried experience of the special clergy for this special work, and to the great appreciation of the sailor for his own church; and I do not hesitate to say that fifteen years' experience amongst seamen shows me that the latter plan is the one that has succeeded in a most remarkable manner in reaching our seamen; and I do not wonder then that that society working on these lines—the Missions to Seamen—has steadily grown in its organization, and now is doing useful Church work amongst our seamen in fifty-one stations in the United Kingdom, and fourteen abroad, with a staff of thirty-eight ordained chaplains and sixty lay paid readers, and that it is so largely supported throughout England. I find that last year it was supported by offertories in one thousand two hundred churches; and I say this, not because as one interested in the welfare of seamen I feel it is sufficiently supported, as with the many earnest appeals for its work in other ports where it cannot yet provide chaplains and assistance, one would long to see further help throughout our churches; yet it does show that the plan on which it endeavours to provide for the moral and spiritual welfare of seamen has the approval and support of the Church generally.

When it has been the means of spreading the circulation of the Bible amongst the seamen, and has sold 3,692 Bibles in thirty-one languages, and 806 Prayer-books in nine languages during the last year, and 69,842 Bibles and 15,645 Prayer-books in fifteen years, it shows in one branch of its work a distinct power of reaching the seamen, and also, may I not

say, that it also shows that our seamen do read the Bible and use our Church liturgy, if they will purchase them in such large numbers. And while speaking of the work of that Society, I cannot but express thankfulness for the way in which during the last few years it has gradually become, not only a great evangelizing society, reaching the sailor by preaching and circulating religious literature, but it does now more year by year in the way of teaching and feeding those seamen spiritually whom it does reach. The opportunities for worship, for preparation for confirmation, for the reception of the Holy Communion, have manifestly increased, and the attendance at daily prayer in eight of the seamen's churches is really remarkable; in one church eighty-eight, in another sixty, and in others from fifteen to thirty attend daily; and there were nearly five thousand communicated in some of its chief seamen's churches last year. I would not wish to imply for one moment that much good work has not been done in some sea-board parishes by the assistance of the S. Andrew's Waterside Mission in helping to provide a curate in such populous parishes to try and reach the sailor through the ordinary parochial machinery, and to help him join in worship with his family in the parish church. I have every reason to believe that in parishes in which many seamen reside that the clergy welcome assistance towards the provision of an assistant curate who may be able to visit the ships in the docks in that particular parish, or the homes of the seamen. And I would also not pass over the regular ship visitation in the Thames by the workers of the Thames Church Mission. But I do wish that there might be a coalition of such societies, working for the same object, with due regard for their special features and line of operations, and thus prevent a possible over-lapping and the many incident-working expenses by such over-lapping, especially in the management and official expenses of such societies, and the competition, which is not always healthy, in the efforts to obtain support. It is difficult for the country clergyman to know which is the society which is doing the best work, as he receives, post after post, the most urgent appeal for an offertory in his church from one society after another, working amongst the same class of men, and, if not in his case, it often is in the case of the appeal to the generous lady, that the greatest advertiser meets with the greatest success. I would wish that at any rate we may in our Church not have any further increase of numbers of such societies, but rather strengthen and consolidate the societies which do exist for this particular purpose, and help them to extend their work, for these special reasons :—

(1) That the seamen may recognize in the Church's work amongst them a unity of spirit and action; a mission flag of the same symbol in each port; a close communication of sympathy and effort in each port; commending from one port to another the communicants as they sail from sea to sea.

(2) That the work may be carried on the more economically, and save much in management and advertisement.

(3) That the work may never suffer from any feelings of rivalry or competition.

(4) That the employers of seamen, the shipowners, may be brought into closer touch and sympathy with the one expression of the Church's work amongst their men.

It is, I feel, in this last point all important that the shipowner may have a close personal interest in the working of a society in which he is so much interested. It has been most evident that steady, earnest Church work amongst seamen has materially affected the moral life of the sailor in port and on shipboard, and it is to the advantage of the shipowner to support and strengthen the work that is affecting the character of his men. The most skilful and well-instructed captain is utterly untrûstworthy in mid-Atlantic, even in the best found and equipped ship, if he is a man of unsteady habits. Crews are now going on board their ships from the quay side, steady and ready for work, in many, many cases, in great contrast to the past, when often the sailor's bag had first to be hoisted aboard, and then the drunken sailor after it, as he was just driven down to the dock from a vile boarding-house, where it was to the advantage of the boarding-house master that he should be able to get the man away under the influence of drink.

The shipowner is fully aware of the valuable work done by such societies, but when they are numerous he has not the same opportunity of closely identifying himself with them.

In Liverpool, where almost all the work amongst the seamen is done by the Mersey Mission to Seamen, which is working as an independent branch with the Missions to Seamen, using the same flag and connecting itself with all the other branches of that society, the shipowners take a most active and interested part in its work, and two-thirds of the subscriptions come from the shipowners, who have a very large representation on the board of management. They are able at once, in all matters affecting the morality of their men, to communicate straight with the one Society; and the chaplains are in constant communication with them and their ships. And as an instance of this, in commencing the teaching of cookery to sea-going cooks, all the shipowners, both of steamships and sailing vessels, unitedly arranged to give preference to those cooks who had obtained certificates at the cookery school held in the Seamen's Institute, and consequently the school has been well attended now for three years, and three hundred and thirteen cooks have obtained certificates, and the cooking on board ship has been materially improved in very many ships.

There are, of course, many other ways in which the shipowners interest themselves in such institutes. But all efforts will still be very much impeded and hindered till the shipowners are able to do more towards the moral and spiritual welfare of their men. Especially I would refer to—

(1) The encouragement of Sunday services on board ship at sea for the officers and men.

(2) The discontinuance of sailing from port on Sundays, or allowing work to be done in foreign ports on Sundays.

(1) With regard to the holding of services at sea. On many passenger ships this is carried out, but mainly for the benefit of passengers, held at a time and place for their convenience rather than that of the crew.

Though a very great deal is expected of the present master of a ship, he is expected to be a good navigator, a disciplinarian, a good head for business to manage matters of business in some ports, a doctor or surgeon to dispense medicine and heal broken limbs, yet I think we may expect him, without being too great a theologian, to be able to read

service on Sunday for his men, and if he is not a preacher to read them a short sermon from one of our, I will not say great preachers, but at any rate short and practical preachers. Why should not the captain of a large merchant ship, be it a cargo boat or ship, be expected to do as the captain of a ship in the Royal Navy, to cause the public worship of Almighty God, according to the liturgy of the Church of England, to be orderly and solemnly and reverently performed, and the Lord's Day observed according to law.

There are difficulties we know in the case of Nonconformist shipowners, or Nonconformist captains, also in so many ships now being managed by a company composed of men of all denominations, yet still the shipowner who values our Christian privileges of worship must in consistency of character endeavour to afford to those he employs every facility for such privileges.

It is most disappointing and discouraging to a young seaman who has been brought up to value the means of grace to go voyage after voyage to sea and never to be invited to join with his shipmates at sea in divine worship. There are, we are thankful to say, many bright exceptions, in the case of those ships where a pious captain or officer, or even sometimes seamen before the mast, will gather round him on a Sunday his shipmates and conduct divine service. But we need more than this, we require some united action and arrangement through the shipowners for such opportunities to be afforded to their men.

(2) The first point is very closely related to the second—that of the importance of giving to our seamen the possibility of keeping the fourth commandment.

We sometimes hear very hard words spoken of the sailor by the shipowner. His careless and sometimes intemperate habits are shown up to the eyes of an unsympathetic world, and yet we often find that the very shipowner who says these hard things is one of those who may perhaps go to our Church on a Sunday, and sing after the reading of the fourth commandment the kyrie asking the Lord to "have mercy upon him and incline his heart to keep that law," and yet arranging that his ship shall sail on a Sunday, and even sometimes in a foreign port that the cargo shall be either discharged or loaded on a Sunday, and thus robs the sailor of the opportunity to keep God's law, and of the opportunity also of obtaining the means of grace to live an honest, upright, and moral life. To expect a moral life in the sailor he must be given a fair opportunity by his employers of living it

But in speaking of the neglect of the Sabbath in our merchant ships, I cannot forget that I am reading this paper in a diocese with seaports, out of which sail fishing boats rather than merchant ships, and I am sorry to say my impression has always been that there is a greater neglect of the Sunday privileges by smack and fishing-boat owners in this diocese than in any other.

I have had in a parish further north of this, fishing boats from Fifeshire, from Cornwall, and from the Isle of Man, and from Lowestoft and Yarmouth, and I have seen the boats tied up on a Sunday from all other parts of England and Scotland, while all the Yarmouth and Lowestoft boats sailed Sunday by Sunday except one Lowestoft boat. I am sorry for the parents of smack lads who have to send their boys on board of a smack that sails and fishes regularly on Sundays.

I am sorry for the clergy of this diocese who may have prepared a boy for confirmation, and when he becomes a communicant finds himself on a smack that knows not a Sabbath Day.

From information given to me, I understand that out of two hundred and fifty-five smacks sailing out of Lowestoft, only ten smacks abstain from fishing on a Sunday, and only twenty-five luggers out of the great number from the same port abstain from Sunday labour. And I am led to believe that very many of the smack-owners are professingly religious men, who doubtless ask God in their own church or chapel to help them to keep His commandment, and yet at the same time allow their smacks to go to sea and work all Sunday. I have not been able to obtain the same valuable information with regard to Sunday fishing in boats sailing out of Yarmouth, but I am given to understand that the single boats from that port work on Sundays just as on a week-day, but in the fishing fleets the trawl, though hauled in the morning, is not shot till sundown.

But I shall say but little of the fishermen, for I shall hope that there may be from this diocese some speaker who will give us information of what Church work is being done by our *Church* societies in the North Sea, or amongst the men who go to fish from the ports in this diocese, and whether such efforts are really affecting the moral lives of the men, and touching them with a more than temporary influence.

Before concluding my paper, there are two or three matters that I would like just to mention as especially calling forth the immediate attention of all friends of seamen.

(1) The further development of the system of transmission of wages from the port of discharge to the homes of the sailors. We are thankful that the experiment has been tried in a foreign port, in that of Dunkirk, and we sincerely hope that the Board of Trade will still further extend this great boon to the seamen in other continental ports, and that all friends of seamen will bring this forward before the officials of the Board of Trade.

(2) The great need of the adoption of some preventive measures to save the seamen at San Fransisco, and ports similar to this, from being forced to desert their ships.

The forces brought to bear upon them are :—

(*a*) From the landsharks, who greedily rush aboard the ships as they arrive in port; they persuade seamen, and in some cases apprentices, to desert from the ship. In 1893, 2,000 seamen deserted in San Francisco, and in so doing they lost the wages earned on the outward voyage, and then were shipped off as speedily as possible by the boarding-house master, sometimes under the influence of drink, only after one or two nights on shore, sacrificing also an advance of about £8 on the homeward wage. The poor wife welcomes back her husband, after all his labour, almost penniless.

(*b*) But we fear that the force brought to bear upon them to desert is, in some cases, not only from the landshark, but also perhaps—guilty, and indirectly—from the shipowner, to save the wages and the food while the ship is delayed in San Francisco. If the ship has to stay some time in port, it distinctly pays the shipowner to give his captain a gentle hint not to prevent the seamen from deserting.

We do need that the law which is able to deal with this should be

brought into action, and that crimps should be prevented from going on board the ships as they arrive, and also that chaplains and sailors' friends should warn sailors of these dangers. We need a very close touch and union between the mission work amongst the seamen in foreign ports and home ports, and where the demand is greatest now, without doubt, is in some foreign ports. There have been during the last two or three years very excellent extensions of work in San Francisco, and in Sydney, and at Kow-loon, opposite Hong Kong. But the need is greatest at Melbourne, Adelaide, and very especially Singapore.

It will only be by the earnest efforts of earnest-hearted men, who are devoting their whole soul to the needs of seamen abroad, men like Mr. Goldsmith at Hong Kong, and Mr. Fell at San Francisco, that will secure for the seamen privileges and opportunities of which they are deprived in foreign ports.

Mr. Goldsmith has already done much to lessen the Sunday working of cargoes in Hong Kong, but more needs yet to be done, by a united voice appealing to the representatives of our Government in colonial ports, or representatives of other Governments in foreign ports, to protect the seamen from undue burdens.

The field of work in foreign and colonial ports is wide, and the moral condition of the men in colonial trading ships is evidently very far from what it ought to be. The account given in *The United Service Gazette*, of the 7th of last September, discloses a moral degradation which would not be allowed for one moment on ships sailing from home ports. This is accounted for by the presence of so many Asiatics with their objectionable heathen customs.

I would not end my paper without the same hopefulness with which I began. The more the light of the Gospel is brought into the life and surroundings of seamen, the more it shows up the evil and the greater need of work, and though the difficulties and trials of those engaged in the Master's work amongst seamen are in some ways peculiarly severe, yet at the same time there is not a more appreciative and more responsive class of men with whom to spend one's life than that of the seamen.

ADDRESSES.

Sir GEORGE BADEN-POWELL, M.P., K.C.M.G., Liverpool.

I DO not scruple to say that we meet here this afternoon to discuss the most practically important of all the questions that will come before this Church Congress. It is of the highest importance to the spiritual, to the moral, and, I think I may use the word, to the commercial welfare, not only of the sailors themselves, but of all of us who live in this great centre of the Empire. I consider it a proud privilege as a layman to stand on this platform—although I think the subject is of such vast variety and magnitude that I cannot hope to enter into any details—still, I consider it a privilege as a layman, who has had more experience at sea than, I suppose, any other layman at this meeting, to stand on this platform to advocate the cause of the sailors. I have been at sea frequently all my life in nearly every part of the globe. I have seen more foreign ports than it is allotted to most men to see, and having this experience it has given rise to a feeling of personal indignation that our Church and our

nation has done so little for the religious and moral welfare of our seamen as has been done in the past.

You have already heard what has been done in some places. I have the honour to represent the Docks Division of Liverpool, and I must confess that, if all shipowners had done what has been done by the shipowners and officers in that place, then we should not have to complain of any lack of success in dealing with this great subject. I believe that the men who earn their livelihood on the sea in connection with these islands number something like 600,000 bread-winners. More than half of these go to sea on long sea voyages, and the remainder are fishermen and coasters who go short voyages. I believe the dioceses of this country each contain on an average not more than 170,000 or 180,000 bread-winners. Our sailors then, if on land, would represent, if the number of bread-winners were taken, three or four separate dioceses, and that would mean, according to the clergy that we provide in our dioceses, something like 2,500 clergy working among them. We all know that there is not a fraction of that number at work among our seamen, and to-night we have heard the vigorous remarks of two clergymen who have worked in this country, and I do hope that many of their remarks have gone home. There is a part of the subject which we have not time to go into, and which I wish especially to deal with, and that is the actual details of the work among our seamen while at sea, and while in distant foreign and colonial ports.

Now, I venture to think that, although several organizations have got to work, and have already done good work, that work has been done chiefly and in the main in our home ports and roadsteads and in our own home districts. But, as I have said, where we have our greatest task is to deal with our seamen while they are away from the home districts—while they are at sea. And may I remind you that our sailors are the only class of workers who necessarily leave their homes and their parishes at a very early and tender age. Most seamen go away from mothers and pastors at a very early and tender age, and face the hardships and temptations of the world. But, on the other hand, with my experience of seamen, I have no doubt that they are a peculiarly devout class of men, and, therefore, they are naturally excellent ground for spiritual work. These two considerations make it necessary that we should at once get to work, and they show that we have a very hopeful prospect, and if any proof were required it is to be seen in the way in which seamen respond to efforts of this kind. The excellent Bishop of Gibraltar has established, at all events in the Mediterranean, what is known as a Seaman's Guild, where each seaman binds himself, in the first place, to daily prayer and reading of his Bible; in the second place, always to attend public worship wherever he can; in the third place, he binds himself to observe the Lord's Day; and, in the fourth place, he binds himself to lead a true moral life. That is a guild that is joined very freely by seamen, a fact which illustrates what I have said.

I will give another instance of the way in which these seamen are ready to help themselves. The "voluntary associates" of the Missions to Seamen Society already number nearly one thousand, and they are chiefly officers and men belonging to our Mercantile Marine. They, again, practically pledge themselves to Sunday worship, and many of them to Bible classes whenever occasion arises, and all of them to Christian practice in life. I know very well that in the Royal Navy the Church is represented by the captain, and he has to see Divine service performed every Sunday, and the Lord's Day properly observed. I have the good fortune to own a yacht, and we number on board some twenty-two to twenty-five human beings; and perhaps I may mention that last winter we were in Sierra Leone harbour. It was a misty, hot Sunday, and we had our usual service; and while we were singing one of our well-known hymns,

we heard over the waters the very lusty singing of another well-known hymn by the crew of Her Majesty's gunboat *Widgeon*. I can assure you that the fact of hearing our fellow-countrymen join, in another ship, in the same Liturgy, on that Lord's Day, affected me very deeply, and I am sure it affected every one of us. Many of us would like to see it ordained that no ship had a right to fly the British flag except they hoist on Sunday the Church flag, to indicate that religious service is being held. I had put down many details here, because, as I happen to be a Member of Parliament, I was thinking about saying something regarding what could be done in Parliament; but time will not permit. You have heard, however, about the transmission of wages, and that was practically managed by Parliament; and I hope that Parliament is going to have something to say about Sunday labour in ports. I hope that something may be done towards consolidating the various agencies at work, for I feel that much of our task is outside the reach of the parochial clergy. We may perhaps remember that in another Church when they wish to deal with matters outside the areas of their parochial organizations they place them in the hands of bishops, who are termed bishops *in partibus infidelium*. It has occurred to me that if we had a bishop *in navibus fidelium*, he might do some useful work. But I am not a clergyman, I am a layman, and therefore no authority on Epispocal functions; and I do wish to say one word on behalf of these external organizations, because they contain a number of laymen who do good work, and who get other laymen to subscribe money to carry out that work. I do believe that, although these organizations may be numerous, they fulfil the great rule of trade, that competition is necessary in order to attain success; and while I feel that they might be combined for purposes of economy, and to keep them all on the line, still it is a sign of healthful vigour to find them all at work, although the principles upon which they are founded may be slightly divergent. I do hope that in this great Church Congress the wealthy, and especially those who make money by shipping, will, as they ought, consider this great body of seamen who bring them their wealth.

The most practical shipowners are now looking round to get the most religious seamen and officers. They know that they are the most reliable, trustworthy, and healthy, and they know that in a ship manned by men of that kind you are sure to have good work well done. The country is growing enormously, and I do feel that the chief agency of that growth has been our seamen and our ships, and that together with the expansion of England there ought to be a corresponding expansion of the Church of England to cover this great new area for its work. I should like to see the British flag the recognized emblem of a Christian ship with a Christian crew on board, and I should like to see every British sailor all over the world—and remember our British sailors are the points of contact with native races all over the world—I should like to see the British seaman become, not only the pioneer of our trade and commerce, but a messenger of the Gospel of Peace.

It is a great imperial work this looking after the spiritual necessities of our seamen. I trust we may one and all of us leave this great hall determined so far as in us lies to enable our seamen to bring to fruition the bright vision of the Psalmist—"If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall Thy hand lead me, and Thy right hand shall hold me."

The Rev. FORBES A. PHILLIPS, Vicar of Gorleston; Founder and Chairman of the North Sea Church Mission.

IT is with pleasure that I address you on this subject, "The Duty of the Church to Fishermen," not merely because I represent a large fishing parish, where I know

many are thinking of what will be said here to-day, but because assembled here in the presence of the leaders of the Church, one cannot ignore the fact that the first great pillars of our historic Church were fishermen. Nay, before there was a Church of the new order and dispensation, the one who had the boldness to take the first plunge, the one who came bravely forward, while all beside held back from the Saviour of men, timid or irresolute, was Andrew the fisherman. And in after-years, though others may have held more commanding positions, and by their memorials left us a more lasting idea of their importance; though Paul may have travelled over a wider area, and by his splendid gifts and education have been instrumental in gathering more numbers into the fold of Christ's Church, yet to the fisherman Andrew belongs the unique glory of making the first venture of faith, of being the first to cast off the moorings which held him to the stagnant shallows of Judaism, and to launch out into the vast deep of the Catholic Church. A fisherman's courage, a fisherman's ardour, a fisherman's faith it was that leaped forward, that took the first plunge, and made the way easy for those who would follow—for it is the *first* step that costs. Yes, where one, only one has gone before, it does not require the same amount of resolution to follow.

And the sterling qualities which drew the great loving heart of our Lord towards these toilers of the deep, these sterling qualities, I say, still are present with all their vast powers for good in the men for whom I speak—the North Sea fishermen. Courage, sympathy, self-denial, all the best qualities which underlie the fundamental principles of religion, all are there, as they were of old time in the breasts of those men who plied their dangerous vocation on the Sea of Galilee. I have lived among the fishermen of the East coast the greater part of my life—the whole I might say. I was nursed as a child by fishermen, and the first words of religion I remember hearing came from their lips, so I can claim to know those for whom I speak. The fishermen of the North Sea have had their character blackened by men who never really knew them, or had their own reasons for speaking as they did; but I tell you, long before any organized mission work was ever undertaken in the North Sea, these hardy toilers were as tender-hearted as children and as courageous as heroes. What is more, they met together for worship, and the book in frequent use was the Book of Common Prayer.

Sailors I no need speak of. They are well provided for by that excellent society, the Missions to Seamen.

But let us be quite clear as to the peculiar character of the fishing for which I speak. There are, as you know, many different kinds, but the time is short that is at my disposal, so I will confine myself to that which I am most interested in, viz. :—deep sea trawling. This differs from the West coast work. Our men are at sea from eight to ten weeks at a time, and fish in immense fleets. Their fish is conveyed by means of steam carriers to London. After this period at sea, the men come home for a week's rest ashore. Now the difficulty of dealing with them, and adapting ordinary parochial means to their requirements, will at once occur to you. Their short breathing time in port naturally they wish to spend with their wives and families. If we call to see them, they are pleased; but still we are in the way—and we feel it.

Now what is to be done?

We must do as our Great Master did. We must go to the men at their work. We must accompany them in their fishing expeditions. We must, like our Great Elder Brother, make their dangers our dangers; their hardships our hardships. There must be no mere yachting expeditions. This is worse than useless. We must have a church out there with *working* clergy—men fired with missionary enterprise, men who will go out prepared for hard living, men with the burning love of Christ in

their hearts, and the fire of Pentecost upon their brows, prepared for all the dangers and self-denial which characterized the early missionary work of the Catholic Church.

You have no right—you who worship in comfortable churches—you have no right to think that a Churchman out there, merely because he happens to be a fisherman, must be content with an unsectarian nothingness, in place of the Church services for which he asks, and which he has a right to expect. Out on the North Sea there is a permanent parish of over 11,000 men, who lead a life devoid of all that makes existence tolerable. Yet Churchmen have been content that these fishermen, a large number of whom are Churchmen, should have nothing more than a Salvation Army kind of service, which, if they attend, they are invited to make a declaration that they are saved, so that the return of souls saved may be tabulated, added up, and sent in with the fish we have for breakfast.

Church work cannot be done under such conditions, and our fishermen as a rule turn from such ways with loathing and disgust. For they are the very last men in the world to parade their religion.

It must be the old Church of our country; nothing less, with her clergy and her sacraments, and I can assure you such efforts are warmly appreciated. Clergy from Grimsby and Brixham have gone out to the North Sea, my own curates have done it; but we must keep a *Church Ship* out there. All honour to the clergy who have gone out, but we must have a Church there in which the sacraments can be administered. Yes, and we must have a bishop go out there to administer the rite of confirmation. What would a mission district be without a Church?

My brethren, you see the great want.

An effort this year has been initiated—The North Sea Church Mission, which was formed at the urgent request of the fishermen themselves. This society, small as it is, is supplying to some extent this great and pressing need. The Additional Curates Society, in spite of crippled means, has voted £60 a year for a sailing curate's stipend.

For the last few months the committee have kept out at sea a smack, fitted up below as a church. There has always been one, often two clergymen on board, and their reports are most encouraging.

The fishermen crowd to the Church services, the ordinary services, and a great work is being done; but the smack is old, leaky, and unsafe. The mission is now endeavouring to raise £2,000 to build a vessel suited for hospital as well as mission work. I sincerely hope they will be able to carry out their intentions.

Another important question the North Sea Church Mission is grappling with is the insurance of fishermen. We are prepared always to help a man with a wife and family to insure his life, and the young men are looked after and urged to join our friendly society.

A field of useful work opens out here, and connected with the Church and Mission it inspires confidence. It is, too, a great encouragement to thrift. Such a work, embracing as it does so many useful features, is worthy of the support of all. If thousands can be found for a Spanish Bishopric, and Italian Reform Missions, surely we can give to our own fishermen, to whom we are all more or less indebted, a Church at sea.

My friends, I do wish I had time to tell you more of our fishermen. I was speaking to one a short time ago. He had just returned from sea. The weather had been bad, and in one gale they were all but lost. He said they were hanging on to the smack as the seas swept over them—"and," added the poor fellow, "I was quite exhausted, and the thought came into my mind to let go, and struggle no more, when one of my chums called out—'Hang on, lads, they are praying for us now in

the old church at Gorleston.'" It was Sunday morning, the hour at which our Holy Communion is celebrated, and we *were* praying for those at sea, for we knew their danger.

I wish I had time to mention some quiet acts of heroism, but I must stop.

Brethren, the harvest there is great, but the labourers are few. Pray ye, yes, pray ye therefore that the Lord of the harvest will send forth labourers into His harvest.

PAPER.

(2) SOLDIERS.

The Rev. T. FELTON FALKNER, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Royal Garrison Church, Portsmouth.

IN dealing with the Church's duty towards the soldier, one cannot but feel that the subject is one which has been frequently brought forward, not only at Church Congresses, but also at smaller gatherings, in connection with the demands made from time to time to different schools of Churchmen on behalf of the soldier and his spiritual needs. We are to-day, therefore, enabled to speak more of this duty as being to a great extent recognized and partially carried out, rather than requiring to be defined and laid down. The reason for this is not far to seek. A large proportion of our population may be divided into soldiers, soldier-civilians, and civilian-soldiers, so that with regulars, reservists, volunteers, militia, and retired soldiers, the military and civil elements are so interwoven that those who can bear arms are to be found in every parish, and well-nigh every family in our land; while of the rest we believe there are but few who do not take an interest in the army, and would gladly do what they can to supply its spiritual needs. Hence, the soldier being what he is to-day, stepping forward of his own free will to be in readiness at any time, and in any clime, to assert his country's claims, and defend his country's honour; and the Church being what she is to-day, showing an active interest in all her sons, whatsoever and wheresoever they may be, whether wild and wayward, or tried and true; whether in camp or cantonment, billeted or in barracks, at home or abroad, the mother's duty has become clear to her that she must leave no stone unturned to retain the allegiance of her children, and put forth all her efforts and all her strength to keep them true to their baptismal vow, and to make them by that token all the more stalwart soldiers of the Queen.

We have, then, the soldier and the Church: the one selecting a path of life which is at once honourable and arduous, full of temptations of the subtlest kind, which come—like the sorrows which ofttimes follow in their rear—"not single spies, but in battalions"; willing to endure hardness, and, if needs be, at duty's call to die for his country; the other caring for him, praying for him, and providing for his spiritual support by the ministry of the Word and the sacraments, utilizing as allies societies and institutions to draw by gentle persuasion and inducement those to whom her voice and teaching are as yet but strange.

In the conditions of the one, as in the activity and methods of the other, recent years have developed a wondrous change, and it is

impossible to speak of the two in their relation to each other without realizing in how many respects this change has shown itself.

The soldier of to-day is a different being to his predecessor of forty years ago. He is in comparison an educated man; he is drawn from a different class of society; he is but for a few years only with the colours; his tastes are higher, he is more intelligent; everything is done that can be done in reason for his comfort, for his advancement in learning, for his progress as a citizen of our great country. He learns self-reliance, self-esteem, self-control; in a word, he is not a fighting machine, but an intelligent agent.

The Church in the army is a living witness to Christ—no longer, thank God, confining her ministrations to the rendering of Divine service within bare walls, before a horde of men painfully perpendicular, but in well-arranged churches, bright and cheerful, with the symbol of the redemption and emblems of the Resurrection, singing the praises of God, and setting forth in terse, plain words the truth as it is in Jesus—and out of Church seeking for individuals with sympathy and encouragement for the weak and wayward, striving by night and day to win back those for whom Christ died. That she is doing a work to-day which, with less freedom, she could not do in days gone by, there is not a general officer but will readily acknowledge. So that, I repeat, the duty of the Church is recognized, and to a great extent performed, towards the soldier, and it is my province to-day just to mention one or two needs on which stress has not been as yet sufficiently laid.

Not by any means least amongst these is that of an authorized lay agency to work in our large camps and garrisons, both at home and abroad, entirely on Church lines, and therefore under the sole supervision and direction of the chaplains. The only organization which at all professes to meet such a want is the Army Scripture Readers' Society; but though this society draws nearly all its funds from members of the Church of England, its agents—except in a few isolated cases—work on undenominational lines, and so their usefulness so far as the chaplain's work is concerned is, to say the least, reduced to a minimum. The work of the Readers is often concentrated in the undenominational Soldiers' Home, the rendezvous of the Plymouth Brethren, or the local meeting-house of those whose doctrines are opposed to those taught by the Church of England. On this account not a few chaplains prefer to be without the Society's Readers, or if they find them in the station have but little to do with them.

The present relationship between this society and Church work in the army is not such as to enlist the sympathies of Churchmen, and though the Chaplain-General and some of the chaplains have done their best on the committee, on platform and in pulpit, to work for as well as with the society, and to secure public support in its behalf, frequent troubles have arisen, giving rise to friction and disagreement, which seriously affect the *bon accord* which should exist between the chaplains and a society which professes to send men to work under their superintendence. With reference to the men whom the society sends, or has sent, I would not for one moment call in question the zeal and earnestness which characterize many of them, nor would I withhold the credit richly due to a few for the unsparing use in the Master's service of the gifts which they possess; but the fact remains that the readers

as a rule are not the men that are needed to-day; that they are not trained to deal with the various forms of unbelief and misbelief, with the callous indifference, or open antagonism, with which they are liable to meet day by day in the barrack-room, the hospital, and the cells. What is wanted at each station, or rather in connection with each Garrison Church, is a trained evangelist; one who from having served in the army knows its peculiar difficulties and dangers, and so can guide and warn the young soldier; one who can stand true to his colours when assailed by the onslaughts of the unbeliever, or proved with hard questions; one whose reading has taught him not only the letter, but the spirit of the Scriptures, as well as never to be at a loss to give a *reason* for the faith that is in him. A *man* he must be, of presence and refinement, of unblameable life, one to whom the men will look up, and on whom officers will not look down. A staunch Churchman, moreover, baptized, confirmed, and a communicant in our English branch of the Church Catholic, whose example and consequent precept will draw others who have not had the blessings he enjoys to worship with him in the House of God, and follow on until they too come to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He has sent. To hope for such men may seem vain, but I believe such may be found, and that the chaplains could find them. It has been suggested that here lies an admirable field of mission work—for it is that, pure and simple—which might recommend itself to one or other of our Universities, themselves training schools to a certain extent for military exercise and discipline, some of whose members of late years have been brought into touch with our Great Camp of Exercise, and have seen there what is done for the soldiers' spiritual welfare—that they might send such an evangelist to work under such conditions. But, be that as it may, I cannot but think that if Churchmen once realized this undoubted need of which I speak, they would subscribe to secure for our Church of England soldiers men who would tell forth plainly the Church's teaching, rather than let the trumpet give forth an uncertain sound.

In no parish, we may be sure, in this diocese would the rector or vicar select a lay reader who was other than a Churchman, or retain him if he were found to be leading the people to the "Brethren," or the like; yet those lads whom you send to us from your parishes are subjected to such influences, and we are powerless to prevent it. It will be a glad day when either the present society sees its way to supplying the seventy per cent. Church of England men in our army with trained readers who will be true to their Church, or another society, supported by Churchmen of all shades, shall make it its special work to provide such to aid the chaplains in their work.

Much has been said and written of late years on the subject of soldiers' institutes, or soldiers' homes, and their advantages social and religious, under this title being included places of more or less amusement and recreation, and less or more of religious exercise in season and out of season. I am under the impression that the first soldiers' institute built in this country, purely for the recreation of the soldier, was that which still exists at Chatham, but, from a variety of causes, fails to supply to the full extent the requirements of the men, while it

has proved a constant source of anxiety to the authorities; but it served as a pioneer of the movement which has provided many useful places for men in most of our garrison towns. With experience borrowed from its failure to touch the spiritual and religious needs of men, other homes have been established, notably by the late Miss Daniell, which have met with considerable support from the public, and from soldiers for whom they were founded. These are still working, and the name of their foundress and main supporter—that Christian lady who devoted her life to the welfare and improvement of the soldier, spiritually as well as socially, and, moreover, laid herself out, as no one else has done so effectually, to administer to the needs of that sorely to be pitied adjunct of the British army, the women "married off the strength"—will never be forgotten amongst either her fellow-workers or the rank and file whom she loved so well.

But these homes were not on Church lines, and so appealed but little to Churchmen, men who had been brought up under Church influences shrinking from the indefinite religious teaching afforded them there. Their Church of England clergy, whether chaplains or parish clergy, were not found in the prayer meeting or Bible class; the place they should have occupied being filled by Nonconformist ministers, ladies and officers (sometimes a second lieutenant, sometimes a retired general officer), on the active or retired list, all doubtless of great earnestness and zeal.

The Wesleyan body soon detected the weakness of such places as regards their own men, but the Church of England was content that the needs of her soldiers in this direction should be supplied by such places of recreation, until the munificence of Lord Cranbrook, and the shrewd common sense and intimate knowledge of the soldier evinced by such men as Colonel J. B. Walker and Captain Clisham, produced what is now widely known as the Church of England Soldiers' Institute at Aldershot. This has given the soldier—what all institutes should give—a club, but a club where the religious element should not blow upon him like a blast to send him shuddering back through the door which gave him entrance, but where the spirit of religion should permeate every room and lobby; where the teaching of the Church should be ever present to him, an' he willed it, in paper, periodical, and picture; where every wall should tell of doughty deed done for God and the country, and where, hard by, the oratory or prayer-room may be found, where the daily prayers are said, religious services, as arranged, engaged in, and instruction given in "The Faith once delivered to the saints." All this has been very helpful to many, for in other places the example set in Aldershot twelve years ago has been imitated, and the Woolwich infant—the last child of an anxious mother—is thriving with wondrous vigour. Such institutions as these are doing good work where they provide a counteracting influence alike to the public-houses, which openly display their attractions, or the all too hidden hells which lie concealed behind some unpretentious door, in the streets of our garrison towns. There are an ever-increasing number of men who, when they come out of barracks, like to find some place where they can sit and write, or read a kind of book not obtainable from the regimental library, or meet men of kindred tastes of other corps; a place, too, where "the stranger doth not intermeddle with his joy," and his

spiritual pulse is not felt by some unauthorized self-constituted physician of the soul. Such a place, then, is afforded them by the Church, and they know it; but the largeness and the business side of these institutes make them a little unwieldy, and not a little source of anxiety and care. In most stations I am convinced that a Church room of fair dimensions for spiritual work and its adjuncts only (and by that I mean for temperance and purity meetings, lectures on Church history, polity, and so on), is likely to have a far greater effect on the lives of men, and prove a far more efficient handmaid of the Church and ally of the chaplain than the more pretentious and costly institute. Such a room should be, in the case of a camp, *in its midst*, close by the Church door if possible; in the case of barracks, near to the barrack gate. In dealing with the question of the relative values of institutes and Church rooms, we must bear in mind that the need to day of a recreation room is not what it was. The soldier has all that he can possibly require in this way in his regimental recreation room, with its adjoining coffee bar, away from the seductions of the canteen and its habitues. Here he finds every comfort, while in the theatre adjoining the canteen he can, if he desires, find an entertainment of at least an unobjectionable, if not of a very elevating kind, and far away above that which he would find provided for him in the low music halls in the town. That the soldier is satisfied with this, and approves it, is shown by the comparatively small number of men who go out of barracks for their amusement now compared with former days, when the men's interests were not so cared for. So that all we *really need* for our spiritual work with the soldier is a "chaplains' and soldiers' room," which should be supplied with good sound literature—papers, magazines, and books, differing from those supplied to the recreation rooms—games, and writing materials, and should include a devotional room, where those who wish can join in guild meeting, prayer meeting, Bible class, etc., or meet the chaplain for quiet converse and helpful counsel. This, I say, we need in every garrison and camp, and the ground on which we make known the need, and urge its being supplied, is that best of all grounds, *experience*. I say without hesitation that the very best and happiest hours a chaplain can spend outside the sanctuary are those in such a room as I have described, where men and officers of all ranks (in a case on which my thoughts linger, from the brigadier to the band boy) meet together for prayer and instruction and mutual edification; where night after night you will meet men striving to walk as soldiers of Christ, strengthening each other, leading on weaker brethren, thirsting for knowledge, and staunch to their rule of life "not to be afraid to confess the faith of Christ crucified" even in the midst of the ungodly; men who are regular and frequent communicants wherever they may be, and who take down at times to your village churches a love for their Master and an obedience to His commands that may put many to shame. These men are the workers of our Church in the army; these are alike the builders and built up of our guilds and communicants' classes and church rooms, of the frequent brotherly intercourse between men and their chaplains, to be found to-day not here only, or here and there, but in many places, and standing out bright in dark spots, and cheering us on in voice and action and helpful prayer in the ceaseless mission work of the Church in the army.

This great need of our work will, I trust, become more and more known and supplied. At this very moment we are rejoicing in the prospect, and that close at hand, of a new Church room given us by the bequest of a lady, herself a soldier's daughter, who was anxious to benefit our soldiers, which will ere long rise beneath the shadow of our newest church, S. George's, at Aldershot, to take the place of rooms which for some years past have been the centre of active Church work in the south camp, and the Church can do no better work for her soldier sons than give them such rooms as these, which give opportunities which nothing else can yield so well.

I would also emphasize the necessity of giving every encouragement possible to another factor in Church work with which we have to do, inasmuch as it is one of those not infrequent links which bind us as army workers with those who have to do with men in civil life. The Men's Help Society is a comparatively new organization, but if its success so far is a gauge of its future usefulness, it has a splendid work before it. It affords us a means, not hitherto forthcoming, of getting hold of men who have not attained to any perceptible elevation in the spiritual life; who wish to lead a good life, but feel unable to join those whose rule of life is above their powers of present attainment. Such are many in number, and they welcome an organization which affords them help and encouragement in taking a decided step upwards, and keeping a simple rule of plain morality. The companionship this society affords will open up to them a new and a better life, and lead on to a fuller development of the desire for higher things, and the achievement of nobler aspirations; and as men go on from probationers to associates, from associates to members, they become better Churchmen and better men, and from mere morality merge into a higher, because a devotional life, and so benefit both soul and body in consecrating both one and the other to the service of the Master.

This forms an admirable training school for our Army Guild, which is far beyond the standard of the vast majority of men who come into the army. In days gone by, if, indeed, it is not sometimes so to-day, we suffered much from the admission to our guild of men who were unable to keep our rule of life; who found that in seeking someone to lead them by the hand, they had taken a place for which they were not fitted, and so fell back, discouraged and disheartened. The strong meat was not suited to them; they required plainer food, and this the Men's Help Society affords. The merest tyro in the battle of life, or he that has striven and failed, can essay the first step in the society's path, and with the cheering encouraging help of those about him, may, rung by rung, climb the ladder of virtue and integrity and uprightness, learning thereon the meaning of true manliness and true godliness, until he reaches that platform of self-control and self-surrender and sincere devotion which marks the follower of the Man Christ Jesus.

The value of the organization, if well worked, amongst our men, it is difficult to over estimate, and it is increased by the fact that its benefits follow its members wheresoever they may go on leaving the service; there is no snapping of the bond which binds them together. Whether soldiers or soldier-civilians, they are all members of a brotherhood, full membership in which is a guarantee of qualities which mark a trustworthy man—honesty, sobriety, purity, self-control—and a passport to positions

which at least command a good wage, even if they do not carry with them trust and responsibility.

For us in our mission work with men, the probationer's card is very useful. In dealing with young fellows there is a great danger in putting before them too high a standard, and men will triumph all the more gloriously by going step by step. The rapid stride is dangerous; as in other things, so in the spiritual life,

> "To climb steep hills
> Requires slow pace at first,"

and we may fairly claim for the Men's Help Society that it starts from the very beginning, and does not leave the man until it has placed him in such a position as will qualify him for the most exclusive religious society, and keeps him, by virtue of its wide-reaching mechanism, in constant touch and sympathy with it and its members.

There are other questions which I should like to speak on did time permit, questions which perhaps can hardly be called Church questions, and yet such as we as Churchmen are bound to feel an interest in. I will briefly touch upon one only. I spoke just now of women "married without leave," to whom Miss Daniell was so kind a friend. To many this may be unintelligible, but it means that a soldier has married a wife without obtaining official permission to do so, and that therefore the wife, often a most respectable girl, well brought up and trained in domestic service, is not recognized or provided for. Her life is, as a rule, one of penury and hardship, sometimes even worse. If a private soldier can save five shillings a week out of his pay, he deprives himself of every little luxury, and if of that 4s. 6d. goes for rent, what is there left for the wife to live on? Those who have maids who are an object of interest to them, should be careful if they value their peace of mind and their comfort and happiness, not to let them marry a soldier unless they are sure that he has permission to marry, and that she will have the privileges of one "on the strength." The amount of misery and suffering and sin which has arisen from ignorance or neglect of this is only known to those who have been brought face to face with it.

So in many ways the Church can still carry out the various phases of her duty to her soldier sons, and she may well remember that her help and her prayers are, after all, only bestowed on her civilian sons under changed circumstances, when perhaps they need it more, and so, instead of relaxing her efforts, she should renew them and increase her interest in all that pertains to the spiritual edification of our soldiers.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. JOHN WILSON PICKANCE, Warden of the Church of England Soldiers' Institute, Aldershot.

I AM exceedingly sorry to stand here in the place of a layman, my friend Colonel Barrington Foote; my only qualification is that for sixteen years my attention has been particularly directed to the position of "the Church in the army," and I number probably more soldier friends than friends in any other walk in life. "How can we reach the men?" is the question which has been asked again and again in gatherings of Churchmen at Church Congresses, Diocesan Conferences, Ruridecanal Chapters, and at other meetings of Christian workers. But the obvious field of work for men offered by the army appears to be too often overlooked. I venture to think,

from the observations I have made at the last six Church Congresses, that, speaking generally, the people of England take very little interest in "the Church in the army," and this "Home Mission" field is indeed miserably neglected by Churchmen. We find, generally speaking, indifference and want of interest frequently and openly expressed. Men come into the army from all parts of the kingdom, and are sent back again to their parishes, having gained an experience and polish which their brethren, whom they left behind, have not got. In the barrack-room you meet men of all classes, rough recruits, and also men of refinement and education, and just as gentlemen go to the Universities "to have the rough corners of their characters rubbed off by contact with others," so the men who enter the army go back to civil life polished up, and with an experience of men and things seldom to be found among civilians of the same class.

I wish to bring before you the necessity of treating these men as individual "members of Christ." We are too apt to think of the army as one great organization, and it must also be remembered that these men come together at a critical age, when men need care, sympathy, and advice. They are, in my experience, capable of responding to these; and individually they have a right to the care of the Church of Christ. Men join the army in many cases unconfirmed, sometimes unbaptized, "with only the nebulous outline of religious teaching which men pick up in many Board schools." I will not now press or dwell upon those lower motives of policy, which might with some carry great weight—that these men go back to civil life at the rate of from 17,000 to 22,000 a year, soon to become the heads of families and voters in the land; nor will I dwell upon the difficulties of the soldier's life, except to say that the atmosphere of barrack-life has been sometime described as "a moral simoon." Lord Methuen, speaking last Saturday week, told us that drink is the source of three-quarters of the crime in the army—that men come into the army only too well taught the use of bad language; but I wish to press upon your attention the fact that although drink is the recognized source of so much crime in the army, the magistrates have licensed 105 public-houses, etc., in the modern town of Aldershot, whilst every soldier is provided with the drink that is necessary for him in his own canteen.

Soldiers are not more depraved than other men, but the Church treats the army as something outside itself, as something which is cut off from it, and as a separate thing. Mr. Murphy seemed to feel this at Exeter, when, in a lovely paper, in which he painted an ideal picture of a chaplain's work, he said, "Are you not too much inclined to look upon us chaplains as 'free-lances,' and our work as something apart from the Church's work?"

I cannot now dwell upon the devotion of the present Chaplain-General, who is well known to almost all Englishmen, nor can I dwell upon the devotion of many of the chaplains under him that it has been my privilege to meet. In any class of men you will find some who have not all the gifts they were supposed to have when they first entered a service; but the peculiar position of the chaplains in a department dependent upon the War Office limits their power for usefulness in various ways.

Their position causes Mr. Murphy to ask: "Are you not inclined to look upon us as 'free-lances,' and our work as something apart from the Church's work; something that is managed by the State through the Chaplain-General, and the chaplains under him?" And no doubt the chaplains in the Army are not quite like "parochial clergy." I apprehend that a parochial clergyman has charge of every soul in his parish. I know that at Clewer we were taught to visit and try to reclaim any who had erred from the old ways of the Catholic Church; but the chaplain in the army is cautioned against interfering with the men in his brigade whose religious professions

are not those of the Church of England, and in fact he is appointed to the cure of the souls of the Churchmen in his brigade. Then as to the routine work of chaplains, Mr. Murphy told us at Exeter that "it is" (for an army chaplain) "no uncommon experience to conduct, Sunday after Sunday, six full services, inclusive of celebrations of Holy Communion, with four sermons and addresses, single-handed; not to speak of daily services and week-day instructions and addresses, services in hospital and in prison, teaching in the schools, visiting the sick and whole, and catechising the children." I find that each army chaplain had 1,800 Church of England men, women, and children under his charge in Aldershot last week. What time has one man to make personal acquaintance with such a parish, which is his for two years or less? It is a parish of units; and the units are constantly changing. What courageous efforts must he make to get a choir together when it will be broken up in a few months, and all the men under him scattered over the world? I find again the chaplain's official rank, whilst it is a great help to him in some respects, is in others a great hindrance. I remember that the Chaplain-General told us at Folkestone—"I sometimes hear it said that the relation between a chaplain and soldiers can never be a free and unrestrained one, because the chaplain ranks as an officer. That is all nonsense. The relations between most chaplains and their men are most intimate and informal. I have never scrupled to say that chaplains who attempt to be officers are fatal mistakes." But ask a man on the other side why he "would much more readily speak to a layman than to his chaplain? You may say, Why does he not go to his chaplain? I will explain why. He is taught as soon as he joins the army to look upon his chaplain as a superior officer, which he is. . . . A superior officer is looked upon as a sort of judge, who only tries to enforce discipline; therefore, I say, one feels a great reluctance in first going to a chaplain, for you either have to go to the vestry, where he has often some official business to see to, or by chance you may meet him leaving the barracks in a hurry, and you do not like to intrude upon him, and think, well I will put it off to a more convenient time; and perhaps that time never arrives." This state of things is one of the reasons why Dissenters succeed where Churchmen fail, for you must remember that the Government provides chaplains with no official residence in which they might see their flock. I have mentioned some of the difficulties; but besides all these is the need of more chaplains. And I maintain that we Churchmen ought not to be content with the limited number now supplied to the department. We ought, indeed, to agitate for a return to the old English custom of having a chaplain for each regiment, and until that is done—although the chaplains labour to the best of their power—to pretend that they can cover the ground is manifestly absurd.

I have said that the chaplains have no houses. What if I tell you that they have, in many cases, no chapels or churches! As the Chaplain-General said at Folkestone: "It is the duty of the Church to see that fitting buildings are provided in which her soldiers can worship God. . . . Much has been done of late years, but still much remains to be done." Look at the case of Pirbright—there is no roof to cover the Church's worship; look at the provision made at Dover Heights or Canterbury; and at Shorncliffe the accommodation is even worse; whilst at Dundalk there is the riding-school with damp tan to stand upon, and damp forms to sit upon, because the red tape regulation orders that the forms must be scrubbed before they are taken in for Divine Service, and when they have been scrubbed there is no time in which they can be dried before the service commences. The Chaplain-General slaves "for improvements," and all honour is due to the late Mr. Stanhope for the work that he did in this respect.

Sir Lintorn Simmons has said that "in many even very large garrisons, there is

no building set apart for Divine Service, which, therefore, is commonly performed in school-rooms not well adapted for the purpose, and occasionally in riding schools. It is therefore in general difficult, if not impossible, for chaplains in very many stations to have week-day services, and still more to keep their places of worship open at certain fixed times as is most desirable, when men might go and see them in private."

Another most pressing need is some sort of chapel or devotional room in the great hospitals in garrisons. I know that medical men say to the chaplains, "If you will come to me I will arrange that you shall have a room;" but I know also that a devoted chaplain that I could name who was working not long ago in a garrison hospital arranged to have a lantern service in such a room on a Good Friday. He provided himself with all the means for conducting it, and with a man to play the violin to lead the singing, but what did he find? He could not have the room as arranged, and as he insisted upon holding his service, it had to be held in a scramble in another room. Whilst speaking of hospitals, I should like to ask how often the Holy Communion can be administered to the dying as things are now?

Convocation in 1884 recommended that a room should be set apart in every barrack for the use of the chaplain, and an eminent officer in criticising the report of Convocation, praised the recommendation, but it has very, very rarely been acted upon, and it is difficult to get a room set apart, as in barracks spare rooms are difficult to find. This officer, of high rank in the army, commenting on the report of Convocation, disapproved of the sentence the chaplain "cannot well visit them (the men) in their quarters," and said, "It is difficult to imagine that the committee can have been guided to this by any experienced chaplain; the advice seems to be that the shepherds should no longer seek the sheep, but have them hunted to their feet." A very energetic chaplain tells us, however, "that the chaplain's dress is a very real difficulty in the way of his visiting the barrack-room, and that by going there he did more harm than good to the cause of Christ. The men thought the chaplains did their duty because they were paid to do it, and could not conceive a higher motive." I do not agree with this view; but I can sympathize with the difficulty caused by official rank, and personal shyness, and as the late Bishop of Winchester said in speaking of pastoral visitation, there is often a "lack of the very rare faculty of originating conversation with those with whom we do not feel to have many ideas in common."

I have said there is need of more chaplains. I have before referred to Pirbright, the Guards' great camp; but I wish again to do so in this connection, there is no place of worship there; and although there was a large number of men there this summer, it was found impossible to do more than send a chaplain to conduct a parade service on Sunday morning; and although we tried to obtain the help of chaplains or other clergymen to conduct other services, it was found impossible to do so. On the other hand, we find that the Wesleyans have maintained two resident ministers at their Institute for the entire summer.

I must pass over a great many matters which I should like to lay before you. I should like to ask the question, What is the difference between Church of England soldiers' institutes and chaplains' rooms? And I have no hesitation in saying that while in the institute the chaplains can meet the men, in the chaplain's rooms, if the men choose to come there, they can meet the chaplain.

In the institutes we try to treat the men as a whole, and I believe that the men who come into our houses, although they do not all come to the Gordon (devotional) room to join in our prayers, know that the whole of the work carried on in the institute is for the love of God and the souls which Christ redeemed. I wish that my brother

clergymen would recommend to their chaplains young men leaving their parishes and joining a regiment, and that they would speak to every soldier in their parish when he comes back on furlough, and invite him to the Church. And if the churchwardens will see that every man in uniform (soldier or sailor) shall never want a seat, you may rest assured that the roughest soldier will remember and tell of your Christian courtesy in his barrack-room.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

THE time allotted has now passed. There are five clergymen and one admiral ready to speak, but I believe I shall receive the support of the meeting if I act with impartiality under the circumstances, and do not call upon any one of them to address you. It is only fair to state that I have received a communication from Mr. C. J. Hicks, Seething, Norwich, who has been a missionary in connection with the Mission to Deep Sea Fishermen, to the effect that there may arise a misapprehension from a statement made by Mr. Phillips that the society with which he is connected, although calling itself unsectarian, does provide sailors in the North Sea with the celebration of the Holy Communion. Now, I am going to be inconsistent. There is also a soldier present who is anxious to address you for a few moments, and if you will allow me, I will call upon Sergeant Mabbs of Aldershot; and I suppose I shall not be mistaken in thinking that the Congress will be glad to hear him.

Sergeant MABBS, School of Musketry, Aldershot.

I THINK there are none of us here that cannot see at the present time a great awakening in the Church as to her duties towards the soldier. In days gone by, some dry old clergyman would quietly trot to the pulpit on Sunday, and give the same dose of medicine to about eight hundred men with different complaints, and then trot off home again until the next Sunday. I am happy to say things have altered since then. We are men, and you have now sent men to teach us; and I can safely say that, without exception, our chaplains at the present time are the finest lot of fellows you ever met with. They work hard on Sundays and week-days. It is extremely difficult for them to visit all their men—the barrack-rooms are too far apart; and another thing—a soldier is not over anxious to listen to his chaplain when he is thinking of the best way to get a spot of grease off his belt, etc. To combat with this difficulty, we have, however, in Aldershot, a church-room, such as you have heard of from previous speakers, which was given us by the late Mr. Stanhope. It is worked by a committee of soldiers, and has the chaplain as president. I have not the time to tell you of the immense amount of good that is done by these rooms in the camp. The soldier to enter it has not to dress himself up in his walking-out suit—he may wear what is termed "fatigues." There he meets his chaplain as a friend, not as an officer. Religion is not forced down his throat. Our own particular rooms in Stanhope lines consist of a small devotional room, a room for games (such as chess, draughts, etc.), and another room in which men can write to their friends. There is also a refreshment bar, the profits of which go towards the maintenance of the rooms. We do not try to work without assistance. We are glad to make our rooms the headquarters of any society that belongs to the Church, if it is endeavouring to promote the welfare of the soldier. Our rooms are a great success, and the secret of this success is unity. I learnt that lesson when I was serving in one of our famous light cavalry corps. If the order was given to charge, and the colonel shouted, "Ride close, boys!" no one with any sense would ask the reason why. It was the only way to win the victory. And if, in religious matters, we want to make any impression at all, we must also "ride close." Among the various societies in our midst is one that I should like very much to bring to your notice, viz., the Men's Help Society. I think there are about six branches of this society in the army, all formed within the last twelve months. In my own particular branch we have, roughly speaking, one hundred and fifty members. We go hand in hand with the Guild of the Holy Standard, our workers being members of the guild; and there i

room enough for all. This Men's Help Society is of great assistance to the chaplain in reaching men whose religious knowledge is elementary; and its usefulness does not end with the army, for, by being a civilian society, when men leave the army they are passed on to their different parishes, and transferred either to a local branch or to the headquarters. I should like to see a church-room established in every military station in the kingdom. It has been stated that there is too much "red tape" in the chaplains' department, and that men will not go to their chaplains because they are officers. Now I have seen a good many chaplains, and I can say that rank is not pushed to the front. He is an officer, of course, but first of all he is a clergyman; and it is no uncommon thing to see Tommy Atkins escorting his clergyman home of an evening, arm-in-arm, in the streets of Aldershot. Moreover, I know of an instance of a chaplain, who was in lodgings in the town, and took some soldiers home with him, and ordered refreshments for them. His landlady told him that she objected to serve coffee for "common soldiers." "Very good," said the chaplain, "then we must part;" and within two days that landlady knew him no more. A great many people think that because a man is a soldier, he is necessarily a "bad lot." Even if he is, it is not the fault of the army. You pitchfork a man to us who has no religious teaching, and then, when he dons the uniform, you point to him and say, "He is a soldier, and therefore bad." If you pass men on to us thoroughly educated in religious matters, and good Churchmen, we will look after them, and not let them slip, but give them back to you as good, if not better, than they were when you gave them to us. I would now appeal to you for help on behalf of the soldier and our church-rooms. Give us your prayers, your sympathy, and, if you like, your money, to help us in our work; and then, I trust, when you see a soldier in the street or elsewhere, you will be able to say—not only is he a good soldier of the Crown, but also a true soldier of the Cross. I am not used to public speaking, and, therefore, will not wait for the bell to sound before I cease; but, if there is time, I should like my chaplain and officer to say a few words in my place.

The Rev. F. J. Page Jellicoe, Chaplain of S. George's Garrison Church, Aldershot.

I am somewhat taken aback at having to step forward and address a Church Congress without notice, but I will endeavour to say a few words. You have already heard that the Men's Help is a civilian society, that it has been introduced into the army, and forms a brotherhood among the men. I am glad to say that the whole of the chaplains have taken the greatest interest in that society, and are doing their best to work for the soldier; and thanks be to God the soldiers are doing their best to work for their chaplains. We work hand in hand together, and we find that the chaplain and soldiers do not act as officers of rank and file, but are, in a word, chums. I think that if civilian priests of the great Catholic Church of England would only put this in practice in their own parishes and become the chums of their parishioners, instead of acting so much in their official character, we should find the vast mass of human beings, not with their backs up against the Church, but true Churchmen and Churchwomen, who would step forward at any time to work for the grand old Church of their country. They would then look upon the priest as their confidential friend, and the churches would be packed on Sunday, and periodically during the week we should see our churches packed with parishioners rallying round the altar for the Heavenly Feast of the Holy Mysteries upon earth, instead of there being but few communicants and small congregations. If the priests would rouse themselves, quit themselves like men, and become true friends of their parishioners, like the army chaplains in Aldershot are true friends of the soldiers, the clergy would soon get in touch with their people, the result of which would prove most encouraging to both priest and laity. If time permitted, the soldiers would tell you that they are true friends of the chaplain; this is the secret of our success, and, therefore, much good is being done. Our meetings and voluntary services are packed, and if any of you would pay a visit to our Garrison Churches at Aldershot at half-past six on Sunday, you would find that every seat is occupied by Tommy Atkins and his lassie, or his wife.

AGRICULTURAL HALL,

THURSDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 10TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. Bishop BARRY in the Chair.

THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

(1) ITS ORIGIN AND GROWTH.
(2) ITS CONTINUITY IN (*a*) ORDER, (*b*) DOCTRINE, (*c*) AUTONOMY.
(3) ITS CONTINUITY UNBROKEN BY THE REFORMATION.
(4) WHAT WAS DONE AT THE REFORMATION.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

OUR subject may not seem so much a burning question as it was when the programme was drawn up. But a time of repose ought to be a time, first, of thorough study; next, of thoughtful resolution; and lastly —as truly as at a time of crisis and action—of earnest prayer.

The Rev. AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D., Rector of Scarning, Norfolk; and Hon. Canon of Norwich.

IT marks a new departure in the proceedings of the Church Congress, that the session which assembles here this morning should be invited to concern itself with an examination of the historic title on which the Anglican Church claims her right to recognition as a branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, in which we assert our belief every time that we recite the Apostles' Creed.

There have been, and there are, good men and loyal men in our Communion so profoundly convinced that the noblest title which any Church can put forward is the testimony of the success achieved by her ministrations, and the proofs she can adduce of the spiritual life that has been throbbing through her and going out from her from age to age, that they are inclined to disparage any other claim to Catholicity than that which the presence of Christ in the differences of operation of the Divine Comforter so abundantly justifies. Such holy and humble men of heart are apt to deem it almost trifling to be turning aside to academic questions of ecclesiastical origins. Unhappily, at the present juncture we have no choice in the matter. Such questions are from time to time forced upon us, and of late they have been forced upon us with an aggressiveness which cannot safely be disregarded, lest silence should be taken to indicate timidity—lest it should be assumed that we have no answer to make to vaunting assailants. It is not always wise to let Rabshakeh go on haranguing the men upon the wall. There are

weak and ignorant and only half loyal people among the mixed multitude whose weakness needs to be strengthened, whose ignorance requires to be informed. And such as these, just because they are weak and not strong in their confidence and in their allegiance, have a right to demand that some answer should be supplied to them, which, on occasion, they may use against the beguiling sophistry of gainsayers. If they who call on us to come out to them and share with them the very doubtful blessing of blind subjection to a foreign power, at the sacrifice of that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free—if they, I say, are rash enough to make their appeal to history, then to history we turn, and with no misgiving.

The main contention of Roman polemics is that Britain owes all her Christianity to Rome—that the coming of Augustine to England in A.D. 597 brought the light of the Gospel to a heathen land, and to a people that knew not the Saviour's name.

If that contention could be sustained, then a sentiment of gratitude for the great gift bestowed would rightly exercise a certain force upon some minds; those, I mean, who love to connect themselves with a remote ancestry, and to boast of their progenitors. Let us not talk lightly of genealogy—of natural or spiritual genealogy. It is an instinct with us all to trace the signs and evidences of heredity, which are, as it were, the voices that speak to us from the generations behind us.

But can the Roman contention be sustained? The emphatic No which history gives requires us to review as briefly as we can the unmistakable evidence which existing records supply. The body of that evidence is so considerable, and is so continually increasing upon us, that the first difficulty that meets us is—at what point shall we begin? Perhaps the safest *terminus a quo* may be accepted to be that cautious position taken up by the profoundly learned and profoundly scholarly editors of the Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents, namely, that we have no trustworthy evidence of the existence of an organized Christian Church in Britain till the beginning of the fourth century.

From the year A.D. 286, Britain was for nearly ten years a free state under Carausius, who, it seems, rendered himself not only *de facto*, but almost *de jure*, independent of imperial control. In A.D. 296, Constantius Chlorus re-conquered the island, and added it to his Province or Prefecture of Gaul. We are told that, when the persecution of Diocletian was raging elsewhere, Chlorus would not allow it to go on in his government. Chlorus succeeded to the Empire in A.D. 305, and fifteen months later he died at York. His son, Constantine the Great, was present at his father's deathbed. The very next year Constantine granted full liberty of worship to the Christians in the Gauls, *i.e.*, in Gaul and Britain, and fifteen years later (A.D. 321), the bishops of London, York, and probably Caerleon-upon-Usk, took part in what may be called the first Court of enquiry into matters of ecclesiastical order and discipline ever convened by any Christian sovereign. It is usual to speak of it as the *Council of Arles*. All through that fourth century we come upon mention of British bishops; but perhaps the most curious and interesting incident is that recorded by Sulpicius Severus, writing at the beginning of the fifth century, concerning the so-called Council which met at Rimini in May, 359. All the bishops present were allowed to draw upon the imperial treasury for

their expenses, and all declined to do so except only three British bishops, who were too poor to bear the heavy charges upon their resources. Hereupon the other bishops offered to take those charges upon themselves, by contributing according to their ability. The British prelates declined to accept the generous offer. They preferred to draw upon the imperial exchequer, rather than become recipients of the bounty of their Episcopal brethren, with whom it was important that they should associate upon equal terms. A certain bishop from Gaul named Gavidius, who was present, told Sulpicius that he disapproved of the decision which the British bishops came to; Sulpicius, on his part, thought they were right.

Remember that when this assembly was gathered at Rimini, paganism had almost ceased to be tolerated throughout the empire. Strange to say, its stronghold was still at Rome—in Britain, it is hardly too much to say that Christianity was the only faith that was recognized. Druidism had been practically extinguished centuries before by the hideous massacre of the hierarchy of that mysterious cult under Suetonius Paulinus. Of course there were survivals of the old superstitions; of course there were worshippers of the gods introduced from time to time by the legionaries. And the worship of Mithras in particular seems to have prevailed extensively among what I may venture to call the upper classes; but it is safe to affirm that by the end of the fourth century the Christian Church in Britain was a power in the land. By that time, too, it is clear that profound questions in theology were being discussed among earnest, thoughtful disputants, by men who were well abreast of the exegesis and speculation of their age, and who were living the higher life of devout endeavour after holiness. Pelagius had earned a character for sanctity before he attracted the attention of such men as S. Jerome and S. Augustine of Hippo by his heresies. Considerable fragments of his Commentaries on S. Paul's Epistles have come down to us. It looks as if he had met with opposition at home before he thought of crossing the Alps, and as if he left a following behind him who had adopted his views and professed them as their own. In A.D. 429, Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, two of the ablest and most illustrious men of their time, crossed over to Britain to confute, and, if it might be, to convert and convince the wavering and the unorthodox. But when the famous meeting took place at Verulaminium (now St. Albans), the success of the foreign deputation (as we may style it) was not achieved without some heated discussion. The fact is evident that by this time the British hierarchy had begun to feel the effects of too much prosperity; their wealth had made them proud, and what struck the foreign bishops at the Synod was the haughty arrogance of the British prelates, their luxury, their splendid robes, and the multitude of their retainers.

When Germanus, eighteen years later, came again, he was accompanied by Severus, Bishop of Treves. This time it is probable that he came quite as much with the object of setting the British bishops right in the heresy of Nestorius as on the subjects of Pelagianism; but once again we learn that his reception was not too cordial. Possibly the Britons did not think they needed instructors from the other side of the Channel; possibly they resented the tone of superiority adopted by the foreigners. Certainly it appears from the report that has reached us of

their second conference, that the British theologians considered themselves able in dialectics to hold their own. This second mission of Germanus brings us to the middle of the fifth century, probably to the year A.D. 447.

It was at this time that the old question of how to reckon the time for celebrating the Easter festival was becoming more and more "a burning question" in the Churches of the West.

At Nicæa a canon had been passed on the subject, which, however, settled nothing. For three centuries there was a great deal of divergence. As late as A.D. 455, Leo the Great was disputing the point with the Alexandrine astronomers; but he ended in giving way.

This is not the time or place to enter into the intricacies of a dispute which, when we come to look at it from the mere outside, appears to us vexatiously trivial, as it worries us in the pages of Bede. But, on the other hand, if we remember that the feast of Easter was incomparably the greatest festival, and the most important commemoration celebrated in the Christian Church, it was scandalous that Christian men for centuries could not agree on what day of the year that festival should be kept by one and all.

As long as the patriarchs of the East took equal rank with the bishops of Rome, it was found practically impossible to insist on uniformity in the observance of Easter. But in proportion as the Roman bishops became more widely acknowledged, in that proportion was it possible to insist on uniformity, even in matters non-essential; nevertheless, even late in the sixth century there were considerable differences in the time of keeping Easter, not only in Britain and Ireland, but even in Gaul and Spain.

If, as is not improbable, the second mission of Germanus was concerned, not only with doctrinal questions, but with that other question of the paschal cycles, the very remarkable discovery which Mr. Anscombe claims to have made acquires an interest and importance which can hardly be exaggerated in this connection. If Mr. Anscombe's conclusions are to be accepted by scholars, then it will follow that, as late as A.D. 457, *i.e.*, ten years after the second coming of Germanus, some unknown British computist elaborated an ingenious paschal canon for calculating the time of the Easter festival—almost in the very year when the Jutes made their first settlement in the Isle of Thanet.

The last authentic literary work that has come down to us from this British Church is the famous Epistola of Gildas, which, again, recent research has proved almost to demonstration was written in the year 496, *i.e.*, just a hundred years before Augustine and his little band set out from Rome.

Make all the deductions you please for the exaggerations and violence of language in a writer whose soul was all on fire, and his pen dipped in gall, we have in this work of Gildas a priceless, however distorted, picture of the Church in Britain at the close of the fifth century, and which, coming to us as confirmatory and illustrative of that body of testimony which we have in other sources of information, we can only accept as a gift which the good providence of God has preserved for men to prize and to ponder on in the after time.

From a careful and conscientious examination of all that evidence, the conclusion that is forced upon the student of history is this:—

That at the moment when the Teuton hordes burst in upon our island and the long agony began, there was in Britain a fully organized Christian Church, with bishops and clergy by no means without learning and earnestness; a Church with synodical assemblies and places of worship; with monasteries large and small, some of which certainly survived and were in existence long after Augustine's time; a Church with a liturgy of its own, exhibiting in its rubrics and its ritual some very remarkable and unique peculiarities; and, more noticeable still, a Church possessing a version of the Scriptures which differed from that known as the Vulgate or Hieronymian version, which it seems had hardly travelled as far as our shores when the great invasion began.

Lastly, and perhaps most important of all, the knowledge of Holy Scriptures was so widely diffused among the British people, that when Gildas addressed his fierce increpation to his countrymen, he assumed that those continual quotations from the Old Testament and the New with which it bristles in every paragraph would be familiar to all his readers.

No English puritan of the seventeenth century ever had his Bible more completely at his fingers' ends than this Gildas the wise.

One word more before I pass on to the second portion of this paper. Before the fifth century was half over, *i.e.*, more than one hundred and fifty years before Gregory or Augustine were born, missionaries from Britain had already gone forth to carry the Saviour's Gospel to other lands. Christianity had by this time gained a footing among the heathen Picts by the preaching of S. Ninian, and among the heathen Irish S. Patrick had already laid the foundations of that strange and, to us, almost unintelligible ecclesiastical system, so unlike any other Christian organization with which we are acquainted, and which grew and developed itself in almost complete isolation, shut off for ages from any intercourse or connection with the other Churches of the West, and least of all owing anything to direct communication with the Church of Rome.

Both these apostolic men, Ninian and Patrick, were Britons, and each pursued his method of preaching the Gospel of Christ without a thought of needing any direction or recognition from any foreign bishop or patriarch. The dream of a universal Papal Supremacy had hardly yet acquired distinctness; the attempt to carry out that dream had to wait till Patrick and Ninian had been a hundred years in their graves.

I am painfully conscious how superficially I am compelled to deal with the subject before us in the time allotted. It is even more difficult to compress the facts so pertinent to our contention in the few minutes that remain.

From the landing of the Jutes in Kent to the battle of Faddiley in 584, we may reckon roughly a century and a half. That battle marks an era in the long conflict between the Britons and their invaders. Up to this time only half England had been won. The smaller—not much the smaller—half comprehended the basins of the Mersey and the Dee, of the Severn and the Exe. Draw a line from Cumberland to Dorsetshire, and all to the westward was still a Christian land; all to the eastward was in the possession of the Pagan conquerors.

In Ireland the work of evangelizing the Celtic tribes had been going on without interruption. Then the desire to make Christ known beyond

their own borders began to work in the hearts of these Celtic Christians. In A.D. 563, or thereabouts, Columba, or as it will be more convenient to call him here Columncille (born in 521 ?), educated in the monastic school of Moville, in County Down, left Ireland with twelve companions, settled in Iona, and gave themselves up to studying the language of the Picts. When Columncille felt himself qualified for the work he had at heart he boldly crossed over to Scotland, and from that moment the conversion of Northern Britain never flagged. Iona became the centre of Christian life in Northumbria. It was at Iona that Columncille closed "the noblest missionary career ever accomplished in Britain," on the ninth of June, 597, exactly one week after Augustine baptized Ethelbert, King of Kent, at Canterbury.

Eight or ten years before this, another Columba, whom it will be convenient to speak of as Columban, had also left Ireland. Columncille was an Ulster man. Columban was born in Leinster in A.D. 543. In 588, or thereabouts, Columban was seized with an irrepressible desire to go forth and bring Christ, the real, living Christ, home to the hearts and consciences, not so much of the pagans, who did not know Him, as of those who professed the Christian name already. Columban's mission was that of a reformer; exactly as the mission of S. Francis of Assissi was six centuries later. He crossed over to Britain, hesitated for a little while whether he should stay there, then resolved that he would pass on to Frankland; finally, he started from some port on the Severn, taking with him twelve companions, of whom one certainly was, and three probably were, British Christians. He soon found himself blessed with amazing success in stirring the consciences of high and low among the Franks.

When Augustine was spending those ten months in Frankland, which we know he did, it is certain that he and Columban met. Archbishop Lawrence, who succeeded Augustine at Canterbury, tells us so, and adds that Columban had actually given them the first trustworthy information which they had received about the Britons, of whom they had apparently known little or nothing when they started from Rome.

Gregory the Great had come upon the Northumbrian youths in the slave market, and found them heathens. Yes, they were Deirians—Angles, not Britons; Teutons, not Celts—of that stock which for a hundred and fifty years had been driving the Christian population westward, and forcing them to seek refuge in that western half of the island which was still unsubdued.

When Augustine arrived in Kent, and appeared before King Ethelbert, there stood before him Queen Bertha's chaplain, Luidhard, Bishop of Senlis, in Frankland. What was Augustine, a mere priest, to do? Was he to submit to his ecclesiastical superior, or revolt? He saw the difficulty at once—it was complicated by the intelligence that must have reached him from every quarter that there were other bishops to reckon with. He had made an impression upon the king, and soon induced him to be baptized. That was in June, 597. But in view of the new situation, for which he had not been prepared, he returned to Frankland, and on the sixteenth of November was consecrated Archbishop for the Anglian people. *Archiepiscopus genti Anglorum*—of the Angles, not of the Britons, and on Christmas Day he was baptizing the Kentish folk by the thousand—for those were days when, if the king

changed his creed, his subjects accepted that creed *en masse*. Perplexities increased upon him, however, and he was not the man to work his way out of them unaided. Hence the sending forth of that second batch of missionaries from Rome in 601. Then, and not till then, it was arranged by the intervention or diplomacy of King Ethelbert, that the conference in the plain of Severn should be held—to agree, if possible, on some common action between the British bishops and the foreigners for converting the heathen of the eastern half of the island. As a *sine qua non*, Augustine and his Roman supporters insisted on the British bishops agreeing to adopt the Roman time for keeping Easter. The first meeting broke up with a motion for adjournment; at the second, the British bishops positively refused to give way. And yet were these British bishops so very wrong after all? For a century and a half, at least, the British Church had been passing through the furnace of affliction—persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; perplexed, but not in despair. Who was this Augustine that he should come before them as their lord and master, telling them they were all astray, and presuming to instruct them in their duty? He an Archbishop of the Anglian people—their merciless and implacable foes—and they the men who for so long had borne the burden and heat of the day of trial?

Two years after this Augustine died, and twenty years later outside Kent not a single kingdom had been secured for Christianity by the Roman missionaries. Much of the ground originally won had been lost.

After the death of Justus in 627, Paulinus was the only Roman bishop left in Britain. He had been consecrated by Justus in 625, in the hope of his being able to bring the Northumbrian Church to adopt the Roman Easter. But in 633 Paulinus too fled back to Kent with Æthelburga, daughter of Ethelbert, by Bertha, his queen. All the work Paulinus had done in Northumbria might have come to nought, and for all we can see would have come to nought, but that Aidan and the men of God who laboured with him—the men of Iona, the successors of Columncille, took up that work, absorbed it, and carried it through.

The last survivor of those Roman ecclesiastics who had accompanied Augustine was Honorius. But Kent had long ago ceased to be what it was in Augustine's days—the supremacy which Ethelbert had exercised over all mid-Britain had shrivelled to a supremacy over the East Saxons alone before he died. Soon they, too, fell back into heathenism. East Anglia was still heathen, so was Wessex, not to speak of Sussex, which continued obdurate after the rest had been Christianized.

Honorius, for all his pretensions to be Archbishop of the English nation, had actually no ecclesiastical jurisdiction outside Kent, and with his death—30th September, 653—it is hardly too much to say that the Augustinian mission came to an end. For eighteen months the see of Canterbury was actually vacant, and when it was filled once more the new prelate was a man of English speech and English blood, and his consecrator—for there was but one—was another Englishman, Ithamar, of Rochester. This time we hear of no *pallium* being sent from Rome.

Dr. Hook was clearly right in pronouncing the appointment of

Deusdedit a compromise between the Roman and the British Christians. The claims of a purely papal nominee to exercise supremacy over all the other bishops in England were tacitly abandoned.

Some incidents recorded during those forty years which preceded the second Roman mission, I mean the coming of Theodore in A.D. 668, deserve, meanwhile, our special attention. When we hear of Felix the Apostle of East Anglia, that he was a Burgundian, *ubi et ordinatus est*, and that he landed on our shores in A.D. 631, *i.e.*, some sixteen years after the death of Columban, it is very hard to resist the conviction that Felix was one of those many young men whom the great Irishman gathered round him at Luxeuil, in Burgundy, and that he had inherited the traditions of that famous house, and with them some of the missionary zeal of its saintly founder. Again, it is hard to help thinking, that when a year or two later Felix was joined by the Irish monk and evangelist, Fursey—of whom the Irish annals have so much to tell—hard to help thinking that the call had not come to him from the missionary bishop who looked for sympathy and help to holy Columban's countrymen, and found it where he sought it. Once again, when, just about the same time, perhaps exactly at the same time, we hear of Birinus offering himself as a missionary to the Pope to preach the Gospel in *intimis ultra Anglorum partibus*, it is difficult not to see in this Bishop Birin, or Byrne, or Burian, or Brin, or Brian, the name of some enthusiastic Irishman who was fired with a holy zeal, and who had got to see that for Christ's sake, and for peace sake the time had come when the moot point of the Easter celebration ought to be conceded, and that his call was to proclaim the Gospel of peace. And still once again it should be remembered that when Birin's mission in Wessex ended in comparative failure, it was Agilbert, who had for many years been pursuing his education in Ireland, who took up the work where Birin left it and carried it through so nobly; and that at that same time Aidan was bringing back the Christian faith to Northumbria, and Cedd, the Apostle of the Midlands and of Wessex, was labouring much in the Lord; that Cedd—not Chad, if you please—who himself was consecrated by Irish bishops, while his brother Chad, ten years later, was consecrated by three British bishops, as we all know, or ought to know.

And yet in the face of all these facts, and many more that might be emphasized, we are asked to believe that our forefathers of the sixth and seventh centuries owed all their Christianity to the little band of missionaries that came from Rome 1,300 years ago; the little band that came here so inadequately furnished for the ambitious project they had entered upon, that only when their work had been absorbed by others did its fruit become apparent.

It is not enough to say with Professor Bright that the history of the Church in Northumbria is conspicuously the back-bone of the history of the Church in England during the seventh century. It is not enough to add with Canon Raine that every one of the kingdoms of the heptarchy owes its Christianity to Northumbria, with the single exception of Kent. A far profounder view of the facts of history which modern research is compelling us all to take, is that which was suggested by the late Mr. Haddan, in one of those splendid essays, which, alas, I fear are now almost forgotten. "It is dangerous," he says, "to speculate

upon the issues of contingencies that have not happened. Yet Church historians cannot be far wrong in saying that a mere turn in the scale, humanly speaking, prevented the establishment in the seventh century of an aggregate of Churches in North-western Europe looking for their centre in the Irish and British Churches, and as entirely independent of the Papacy as are the English-speaking Churches of the present day."

With these pregnant and suggestive words, I close—leaving to others to take up the tale at that new departure when Theodore, the second great emissary from Rome, came among us, not to convert, but to rule; not to found a Church, but to organize it after a new method, and with a single eye to bring the new organization under the sway of the foreign ecclesiasticism in which he believed so firmly, and which according to his light he served so loyally. But with these matters I, to-day, have no concern.

---

(2) Its Continuity in Order, Doctrine, and Autonomy.

The Right Rev. Mandell Creighton, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Peterborough.

I must confess to considerable uncertainty about the exact meaning of the branch of this subject which has been assigned to me; but as I stand in place between Canon Jessopp and Professor Gwatkin, I propose to occupy, in time, the period which lies between their two papers. In so doing, I can only make a few remarks upon a few salient points in a simple way.

You have already heard how the Church of Christ came into England from various quarters, with an organization already formed. At first there were slight differences of local usage in points of administration and of worship; but with growing intercourse with the continent, these were abandoned for the sake of harmony. Then the unity of the Church led the way to a unity of the nation, in which Church and State were one. This simple condition of early times was altered by the Norman Conquest, which brought into England more highly developed ideas, and consequently more highly organized mechanism. No great outward changes were made, but things were looked at from a different point of view, and were interpreted differently. They were put into order; they were read into the terms of a system. A more developed organism implies differentiation of functions. So Church and State had their separate spheres assigned them for the first time. Civil business was separated from ecclesiastical business, civil courts from ecclesiastical courts, and common law from canon law. But the king was over all; and William the Conqueror made answer to Pope Gregory VII., "I will not do homage to you, because I do not find that my predecessors did so to your predecessors." Nothing was done to diminish the rights of the English State or of the English Church; nay, they, like everything else, were only made more definite and precise.

The general result of these changes was that the Crown was stronger than it had been before. William the Conqueror used his power wisely; but William Rufus discovered what a powerful engine his father had devised, and the land groaned under his oppression. He treated clerical fiefs as lay fiefs, and kept the See of Canterbury vacant for years. Believing himself to be at the point of death, he tried to make amends

by appointing Anselm. He recovered from his illness, and tried to rid himself of an upright archbishop created by mistake. I need not tell you how he wore out Anselm's patience, till Anselm pleaded that he was ready to answer for his doings as archbishop, "as he ought, and where he ought." The barons supported him in withstanding royal tyranny; they refused to support him in carrying his appeal to Rome. They said that it was contrary to the customs of the realm which he had sworn to observe.

Now this attitude of the barons is undoubtedly marked by that inconsequence which plays so large a part in human affairs, especially in England. They wished Anselm to oppose the royal tyranny, and for that purpose to grasp any weapon which he could find ready to hand. But some weapons were only to be brandished, not to be used; and such was the threat of foreign intervention. Anselm might use it to prevent the king from oppressing him; but he and the king alike were bound to maintain the customs of the realm, and settle their disputes by reference to them alone. You will admit that this was an attitude very characteristic of the English mind; and it is remarkable how soon the atmosphere of their island home exercised its influence on the Norman intelligence. However, Anselm was a new comer, and was not satisfied with this inconclusive result. He made his way to Rome, and laid his case before the Pope.

If we consider Anselm's motive, it may perhaps be stated thus. He turned from the oppression of power founded upon force, to power founded upon an idea of the nature of justice. The legal development of feudalism tended to materialize rights and duties. This tendency was to be counteracted by an ideal extension of feudalism into an all-embracing system, embodied in the theory of the Empire and the Papacy. Christendom was held to be a great confederation, united under two co-equal heads, who regulated affairs by applying those great principles of right and wrong which were sometimes obscured in a smaller sphere. This was an ideal conception which was never realized. Emperor and Pope were seldom in accord, and generally were at war. The Empire declined, and the Papacy increased in esteem. So far as the medieval ideal ever became actual, it was embodied in the Papacy. But I think that in medieval times men were much more concerned to have an ideal than they were interested to realize it. They rejoiced in the possession of principles, but they were chary in applying them. Their principles were, after all, legal and technical, to be perpetually discussed—not ideas, which had an inherent power of conviction and led to immediate action. They must have a good case, and they did not care how far they went to find arguments and precedents to support it; but meanwhile they were ready to maintain their cause by the means which were most easily available.

Another striking point in medieval conceptions is the mode in which men strove for liberty. They did not assert it as a right of the individual, which, indeed, it is not; nor did they strive directly to adjust society so that it could find room for as much individual freedom as was possible; but they tried to free themselves from the burden of excessive demands by setting one claimant against another. No position had such great possibilities as one of divided allegiance; and everyone tried to construct for himself such a position. A remote suzerain with

indefinite claims, and little power of enforcing them, was invaluable as an escape from local authority. By dexterously setting one against the other you could secure a good deal of your own way while professing absolute obedience.

If these tendencies be kept in view, it is easy to see the attraction of the papal supremacy as a theory, and the practical advantages to be gained by the admission of the papal jurisdiction. In England, certainly the theory was strictly limited by a consideration of practical advantages Late in the twelfth century, Giraldus Cambrensis mocks at papal pretensions; the man who at Rome could not make good his rights, even over a garden, is assuming to dictate to kingdoms. Early in the thirteenth century, Adam Marsh saw, in the record that Peter cast himself into the sea to go to Jesus, while the others went in their own ships, a proof that the successors of Peter had the government, not only of one ship, but of the whole ocean; and adds, "The sea is the whole world; the ships are the churches." If we seek an explanation of the difference in these views, it is to be found in the fact that the Papacy had rendered great service to England in the troubled times of King John, and had helped to restore order during the minority of Henry III. The theory of a far-off suzerain had been put into practice, and had been found advantageous.

It remained to be seen how long the advantage would endure. Alas, if the beginning of the reign of Henry III. saw the papal power both useful and popular in England, the middle of the reign saw it harmful and detested. It was the old story of the benevolent protector. "From the root of a protectorship upsprings a tyrant," was a discovery of the political experience of ancient Greece, and that experience is constantly repeated. The protector demands an exorbitant price for his protection, and sets to work to destroy in his own interests the institutions which he was called in to defend England soon took the alarm and began to prescribe limits to papal activity. Exception was taken to the presence of legates; and it was agreed that the Archbishop of Canterbury should be regarded as the ordinary legate through whom papal communications were to pass. Already in 1226 a nuncio had to answer complaints in Parliament about the corruption of the Roman curia, and the pope confessed that much scandal and infamy was deserved. But he pleaded that this came from his poverty; if he were decently rich he could afford to be upright. Let me quote the letter of Pope Honorius III.: "For the entire rooting out of this scandal, we have provided a form, to which, if you are willing to consent, you can free your mother from scandal, and obtain justice in the Roman Court without needs of gifts." The modest proposal contained in the accompanying form was that two prebends in each cathedral and conventual church should be granted to the pope. It is not surprising that when the letter was read in Parliament, "each man made merry with his neighbour over the greed of the Romans;" and the king answered, "This concerns the whole of Christendom. When we, who live in the ends of the earth, see how other nations behave towards such exactions, we will discuss the matter."

I have taken an early instance; but soon our records are full of complaints about papal meddling and Roman avarice. I do not wish to weary you with details. It is with no satisfaction that we follow the steps in the degradation of a great ideal. It is enough to say that its

practical benefit was soon exhausted, and it remained as a burden. The most melancholy lumber in the world is the ruins of agencies that were established for the purpose of reform. Men are ashamed to get rid of them, because they were set up with such fervent hopes, that their failure is only grudgingly admitted. However, the practical result ensued that the Church, which had sought protection against royal tyranny in the pope, was soon driven to seek protection against papal tyranny in the king, by whose side stood Parliament with increasing power of representing the nation. By legislative enactment the papal claims to patronage and taxation were refused, and the introduction of the decisions of papal courts into England was forbidden.

Again, I need not follow out this process in detail. It is enough to say that the Church had to make the best of it between its two protectors, the king and the pope, and suffered at times equally from both. When the interests of the two were at one, they combined to pillage the Church. A strong king was independent and resisted the papacy; a weak king made terms with it, and allowed it to advance. The pope made overweening claims on paper, which the king did not trouble to deny, because he knew that they could be exercised no farther than he chose to permit. The king passed Acts of Parliament which he did not mean to enforce farther than suited his own convenience; but the royal armoury was stocked with weapons which Henry VIII. used with surprising effect. Meanwhile, the Church certainly suffered; its machinery was thrown out of order; its revenues were used as rewards for services rendered now to the pope, now to the king. But during all this time the nation was slowly advancing in self-consciousness; and it was the formation of national sentiment which was ultimately fatal to the papal claims. I have shown you that the early years of Henry III. was the time when the papal power in England was at its height. The reign of Henry III. was the period in which, largely owing to resentment at papal interference, the cry was raised of "England for the English," a cry which found its final expression in the preamble of the Act forbidding Appeals to Rome. "Whereas by divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an empire governed by one supreme head and king."

This, however, is wandering into the next subject, which is inevitable, when my own is too big already; but it leads me to a point which has to be noticed. It may be said that I have been treating the Church as a national Church, whereas the conception of a national Church was not found out in the middle ages. I can only answer that, somehow or other, the Church in England was always understood to serve the people in England; and just as the people who lived in England became the English nation, so did the Church in England become the English Church. When the framers of the Great Charter enacted "Libera sit ecclesia Anglicana," they had a notion that their own ecclesiastical institutions were the object of their special care, and formed part of the common life of that community in which they were specially interested. Again, I say we must go beyond theory to fact. Theoretically, Europe was regarded as forming one great Christian commonwealth; practically, every ruler pursued his individual interests. There was steadily going on a process by which people who lived together and passed through common experiences were combined by a consciousness of common

interests. This was the process by which nations were formed; and England from its insular position was the first to reach this national consciousness. The Church, so far as it was the organ of the nation, passed through the same process. It was part of Western Christendom, just as England was part of Europe. So far as its institutions were part of a universal order, they were unalterable; so far as they concerned the relations of England to foreign countries, they were determined by national needs. About these matters Churchmen were not allowed to have their own way. The strongest instance of this is given by the events of the year 1428, when Archbishop Chichele was so pestered by Pope Martin V. to abolish the statutes which prevented the pope from disposing of benefices in England, that he and the Archbishop of York pleaded the pope's cause before the Commons. With tears in his eyes the Archbishop urged the danger of withstanding the pope. The Commons were not moved by his pathetic eloquence. They only sent a petition to the Council representing that the pope had acted to the prejudice of the archbishop, and of "our aller mother, the Church of Canterbury." They had their mother Church at home, and not even its archbishop should induce them to diminish its independence, which was likewise their own.

I have tried to show you that the Church in England had its own history, and passed through its own process of development. Some people talk sometimes as if it came into being as a branch of the Roman Church; or as if at some period of its history it was merged in the Roman Church. It had varying relations with the Roman Church, which were regulated, not by the claims of Rome, but by the advantage to be gained by England. I cannot put what seems to me to be the historical truth more clearly than in this form: the Church in England, while retaining its own continuity in all essentials, admitted the papal jurisdiction on grounds of utility, and then passed through a long period in which it discovered that that jurisdiction was dangerous to Church and nation alike.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

I CANNOT introduce the next Speaker without one word of preface. We are to have the privilege of listening to Bishop Herzog, whose name is a household word to those of us who have followed with deep interest the Old Catholic movement—a movement which, I believe, deserves its name, because it endeavours to base itself, as we in this Church of ours have always endeavoured to base our position, on the Old Catholic lines of faith and order. I am quite sure that we shall give Bishop Herzog an exceptional heartiness of welcome.

The Right Rev. EDUARD HERZOG, D.D., Bishop of the Christian Catholic Church in Switzerland.

WHEN I had the honour to receive your friendly invitation to take part in your Congress, and to speak on the subject which was assigned to me, I did not for a moment indulge the vain fancy that I was accredited with any special competence to lay before this honourable assembly facts which they did not know as well as I did, and which they cannot discuss

as well as I can. I recognized rather in this kind invitation your simple intent to afford me the opportunity of testifying in an important point our spiritual community with you. I am to speak of the continuity of the National Church in order, doctrine, and autonomy.

The continuity of the National Church! It is the National Church in the abstract that I have in my mind. When does the National Church in general possess this continuity? Obviously when she has existed from her foundation without break, nor has changed her identity in the course of time. An examination into the possibility as to whether the National Church may have been suppressed for a longer or shorter time—as for example by Islam—and may have revived again later on, is not what the Congress requires, but the question does pre-suppose that a National Church might deny its own past and transform itself in essential matters into a new community. Therefore our discussion must deal with the continuity of the National Church in order, doctrine, and autonomy. It is impossible in a short paper to illustrate all sides of this great subject. I confine myself therefore to certain main points, and begin with some remarks about the continuity of the National Church in autonomy.

(1) A National Church must possess autonomy. She is the religious community of the people, who themselves choose the organs of their own ecclesiastical administration, who shape the order and direction of the Church according to their own right, judgment, and needs, and regulate the life of their religious service according to their own tradition. Where no autonomy of the National Church is granted, there no National Church can at all be recognized. Therefore within the papacy in particular there can be no speaking of a National Church. Boniface VIII. declared that the pope holds all rights in the shrine of his own breast (jura omnia in scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere.—Sext. c. 1. de constit. 1, 2.), and in the Bull Unam Sanctam, of November 18th, 1302, he delivered the dogmatic sentence, that it was necessary to the salvation of everyone created that he should submit to the pope. Though one formerly regarded such declarations merely as signs of long vanished times and circumstances, and was disposed to smile at them, still, Pius IX., in 1864, instructed us by another declaration in the twenty-third sentence of the syllabus, according to which the popes have never exceeded the bounds of their authority. But in the third clause of the Vatican decree of July 18th, 1870, every National Church is fully condemned. If the pope has the full and highest power of jurisdiction in matters of faith, morals, discipline, and government over the whole Church throughout the world, and indeed "the whole fulness of this highest power," and if this power is a regular and direct one over all and every Church, over all and every pastor and believer, then one can in reason no longer speak of the autonomy of National Churches; but the Church is, as was already said in the beginning of the sixteenth century by the theologian of the papal court, Cardinal Cajetan, "the slave (serva) of the Pope" Neither as a whole, nor in her parts, dare she will anything, strive for, approve of, or disapprove of anything which is in any way removed from the papal will and thought. (Doellinger, Friedrich—The Papacy ("Janus"), Munich, 1892, page 202, 292).

For this doctrine, Pius IX. appealed, with "the agreement of the Vatican council," "to the clear testimony of Holy Writ." How

ungrounded this was I need not explain to this honourable assembly. But, on the other side, I also would not attempt to prove that the organization of the community of the faithful into a National Church and the autonomy of the National Churches are things for which we can claim "the clear testimony of Holy Writ." Our Lord came for all men and for all times, and has created a human society, "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii. 11). One thing only will I venture to say that He who gave direction to His disciples to go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel (Matt. x. 6), and who held it as a grievous offence that they should thrust His Apostles out of the synagogues (S. John xvi. 2,) may not have regarded the religious community of a people as being a thing of less perfection, or as standing in opposition to the constitution of His kingdom. And the Apostle also who beyond all other men in a like way felt himself a debtor to "Greeks and Barbarians" (Rom. i. 14.), regards, nevertheless, the bounds of nationality, and writes to the Corinthians and the Saints "in all Achaia" (2 Cor. i. 1) and to "the Churches of Galatia." (Gal. i. 2.)

The wine of the Gospel was poured into the existing national vessels. Let him who breaks these vessels see to it that the wine is not lost. The ancient Church held it as unlawful to break through the boundaries of the different National Churches. The first council of Nicæa had already recognized the rule that the ecclesiastical partition should conform to the civil one. (Hefele, Konziliengeschichte, 1st edition, tom. i., p. 366). It ordained that the appointment of a bishop should be a matter for the whole Episcopate of the province concerned (can. iv.); and in the sixth canon, repeatedly asserting the rights of the Metropolitans of the provincial churches, and under appeal to "ancient custom," it gives to the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch an authority over the churches of Egypt and Syria; "because (it declares) a similar relation exists for the Bishop of Rome also." Thus the ecclesiastical communities represented by these three bishops stood in autonomous relations side by side.

The autonomy of the ecclesiastical provinces, and even of the individual dioceses framed within them, is much more definitely recognized in 381 by the second Œcumenical Council at Constantinople. After it had confirmed in the first canon the Nicene Creed, it declared in the second canon: "The bishops who belong to another diœcese shall not encroach upon stranger Churches, and shall not mingle the Churches, but rather according to the canons, the Bishop of Alexandria shall administer the concerns of Egypt only, and the Eastern bishops shall exercise control only in the East (while the privileges of the Bishops of Antioch asserted in the canons of Nicæa, are preserved), and the bishops of the diœceses of Asia shall only exercise authority in Asia, and those who are bishops over the diœcese of Pontus are to govern in Pontus, and those over Thrace in Thrace. Without being summoned, the bishops over these diœceses shall not go out of them to ordain or to perform any other ecclesiastical function. If, however, the rule already cited concerning the diœceses is observed, it is clear that in every eparchy, or province, the provincial synod has to carry out the control according to the limits of the Nicene canons. But the

Churches of God among the barbaric races shall be governed according to the manner which already prevailed with the Fathers."

I purposely quote this important decree of an Œcumenical Council without abbreviation, and herein I follow the translation which Hefele has given in his "History of the Councils" (ii. 16). The subject there is the jurisdiction necessary to the government of the Church. The council does not make the slightest reference to a universal jurisdiction which might be ascribed to the Bishop of Rome, rather it excludes such a universal jurisdiction by its recognition of the branch churches. Only it results from the third canon of the same council that the Bishop of New Rome (Constantinople) has the priority of honour (τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς) after the Bishop of Old Rome. "The priority of honour" says the Œcumenical Council; it is only a priority of honour which it knows and recognizes and ascribes *also* to the bishop of the new capital of the world. The third Œcumenical Council of Ephesus (431) had occasion to protect the autonomy of the ecclesiastical provinces so clearly recognized by the second council. The bishops of Cyprus complained that the Bishop of Antioch, as head of the Syrian Church, claimed the authority to appoint bishops over Cyprus. The council recognized the complaint as well-founded, and asserted the autonomy of the Church of Cyprus. In connection therewith it issued also the declaration: "The same principle shall prevail in all other diœceses and in all eparchies (provinces), so that no bishop shall encroach upon another province which has not been from all times and from the beginning under his authority, that is the authority of his predecessors. If, however, a bishop should have committed such encroachments and have proceeded therein by force, then he must make restitution, that the canons of the Holy Fathers be not transgressed, and worldly ambition creep in under the disguise of spiritual administration, and that we may not gradually without noticing it lose the liberty which Jesus Christ, the Liberator of all men, has won for us at the price of His own blood. The Holy and Œcumenical Council decrees therefore: Each province shall keep pure and uninjured what rightfully belongs to it from the beginning according to the usage which was followed from antiquity. And every metropolitan has the right to take home a declaration of this decree for his security. If, however, anyone puts forth any regulation which is contrary to the decision herewith published, this Holy and Œcumenical Synod unanimously agrees that such regulation shall be null and void."—(Mansi, Concil. t. iv., p. 1469.)

In this recognition of the autonomy of the individual Churches, the matter in hand was in the first place the appointment of the bishops. If a provincial Church had the right itself to choose and consecrate its bishop, it was self-understood that it was autonomous in all other questions of Church government. Already S. Cyprian had written to his colleague Stephen at Rome about the middle of the third century, "In the government of the Church, every head of the Church has the liberty of deciding according to his own will, and is answerable only to the Lord." He enforced this principle in order to assert the rights of the African Church to re-baptize those who had been baptized by heretics on their joining the Church. Equally independent was the procedure of the incomparable Bishop of Milan in the fourth century. S. Ambrose stood indeed still nearer to the Bishop of Rome than

S. Cyprian; he declares that he would be glad to follow the Church of Rome in all things; however, he adds: "But we other people have also common sense, and therefore that which is better done in another place is better for us to observe." (In omnibus cupio sequ ecclesiam Romanam; sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus; ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, et nos rectius custodimus.—De sacram., iii. 5.) Also Ambrose enforced this autonomy in a matter in which one cannot agree with him. He ascribed a sacramental meaning to the washing of feet on Maundy-Thursday, and could not therefore understand that in Rome itself the ceremony of the washing of feet had not survived. But in spite of the fact that the matter concerned was in his eyes a very important one, he was not willing to give up his own judgment, nor the right to follow his own judgment. About the year 400 S. Augustine goes more thoroughly into these matters in the two writings "Ad Inquisitiones Januarii."* Januarius had put the question to the Bishop of Hippo, how a man should act if he entered another Church, and found there quite other customs and usages. Augustine answered, appealing to S. Ambrose, that a man should conform himself in every Church to the usages there prevailing. That was binding on all believers which rested on the support of Holy Writ, on the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils, or on the universal practice of the Church. Everywhere, in fact, there existed certain particular points which a man was allowed to conform to and imitate so far as they were not in contradiction to the faith and good morals (ii. 34). He himself would in fact be disposed to forbid outright certain things which people made into matter of conscience without their knowing why, but he did not always venture to do so, because thereby he gave offence to "some holy or turbulent persons" (propter nonnullarum vel sanctarum vel turbulentarum personarum scandala devitanda liberius improbare non audeo). With a sigh, however, the great Father of the Church confesses that the free religion is thus again laden with servile burdens, and that the position of the Jews was more endurable, for they were at least only subjected to the burdens of the Law, and not to the arbitrary will of human presumption. But that the Bishop of Rome possesses regular and direct jurisdiction in matters of discipline over all Churches, of this Augustine too knew nothing as yet.

When the third Œcumenical Council once more solemnly asserted the autonomy of the provincial Churches, the time of the migration of races had already begun. The division of the West Roman Empire into provinces disappeared, and with it the organization of provincial Churches. It is true that on the ruins of the world that had perished new States gradually arose, but new Church communities would no longer arise which corresponded to the old provincial Churches, with their former autonomy again asserted.

My friend, Professor Woker of Berne, in the brilliant essay which he delivered in the second International Old Catholic Congress at Lucerne, in order to illustrate this fact, calls attention to the dualism which prevailed between the aggressive German Arians and the Catholic natives who relied on their international centre in Rome, to the new

---

* That is just the book from which is taken, not the form, but the thought of the very well known sentence: In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.

Western Empire which in its own interest was obliged to keep down national organizations, to the international monastic orders which in the middle ages shaped Western Christendom in the papal sense to the Romish papacy, which took seriously and enforced the false Isidorian Decrees, and drew more and more to itself all the power of the Church. Opposed by such forces as these, autonomous Churches could not come into existence. How completely the autonomy of the National Church had been absorbed in the West by the Romish papacy is shown by the most famous document since the middle ages in which a Western Provincial Church has tried to assert her right in opposition to the Bishop of Rome, namely, the four Gallican Articles in the year 1682. It is true that these articles have limited the papal power to the spiritual domain, but still they recognize the papal jurisdiction over the whole Church. And even though the third Article establishes that the exercise of the papal power may not exceed the canons of the Œcumenical Councils, yet this makes no alteration in the case after the power itself was once recognized. According to the canons of the three first Œcumenical Councils, there can be no speaking at all of such a power. Gallicanism must at last die of its own inconsistency, and the consistent Ultramontanism defeated it for ever in the Vatican Council, and by the four so-called Vatican Decrees banished all autonomy of the National Church from the community under the dominion of the pope.

I should be disposed to recognize that at least in the Church of England the continuity in autonomy would have remained unbroken, if it had not been that in England too an ecclesiastical revolution had taken place, beginning at the end of the sixth century, in consequence of which the autonomy of the National Church was subjected to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. A thousand years later the Church of England did in fact take back her autonomy, because a possession which belongs to her by God's ordaining could never rightly be lost. So also every other National Church acts legitimately and in accordance with her duty when she tries to recover the autonomy to which, according to the canons of the first Œcumenical Councils, she possesses a right that cannot be forfeited. Schismatic the recovery of such an independence can certainly not be called, *then* especially when it was necessary for repelling notorious and pernicious heresies. And such is the justification of our endeavours to reorganize a National Church.

(2) From what has been said, it follows that, as regards the Western Churches, at least, I do not venture to claim a continuity in autonomy.

Is there a continuity in *Order?* According to the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils that have been quoted, the Episcopate of the autonomous Church provinces was continually to supply itself, and no Church authorities have the right to choose and consecrate bishops over another province. According to this it should be possible to prove in every Church province, or, what is much the same in its signification, in every National Church, a continuity in order. But the same events which led to the break-up of the old Church provinces rendered it also impossible to again fill the empty seats of the bishops in the manner provided by the ancient Councils. There is also, as far as I know, no archive in the world in which one can find the original proofs that at least from the end of the tenth century the bishops of any diocese were regularly consecrated according to valid rights by actual Catholic

bishops, and likewise that the young members of the clergy were just as regularly ordained through the duly consecrated diocesan bishops. Only we may assume, in spite of the peculiar Bull of the Pope Eugenius IV. Ad Armenos of November 22nd, 1439 (Dœllinger, Friedrich—Das Papstthum, p. 209 ff.), that they knew *how* to accomplish a valid consecration, and that the *election* of a bishop was regularly followed by the *consecration* of the same. So surely as men have never been wanting in the Church to bear the office of bishop, so sure is it that the continuity in order is an historical fact.

Is the continuity necessary? Has not the Lord promised His effectual presence to the *community* of believers in Him? (Matt. xviii. 20; xxviii. 20). Supposing that by some unseen event the bishops should collectively and entirely disappear from the earth, would not the Lord's community be empowered to create the Episcopacy anew from their own body? I should not for my part venture to answer this question in the negative. But we, in ecclesiastical matters, must not take as guiding principle what perhaps *might* be, but what actually *is*. It is, however, an actual fact that the Church from the beginning held that the formal conferment of an Apostolic mission was necessary. "How shall they preach, except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 15). So surely as the Apostles prized the privilege of being ambassadors of the Lord, so surely must they have thought of handing down the commission and authority which they had received to their helpers and successors. That this took the form of laying on of hands is testified by Scripture (Acts vi. 6; 2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14). And as surely as Titus and Timothy received special commission to appoint presbyters by the laying on of hands, so positive seems to me the historic fact that the full Apostolic authority was transmitted to the followers of the Apostles, and that there have been bishops from the Apostolic times. Therefore the actual *existence* of the Episcopacy of the Church is to me a sufficient proof that the Church is justified in claiming a continuity in order; in her bishops the bearers of the Apostolic mission reach in a continuous chain, hand joined in hand, up to Christ the Head of the Church. But it is of the continuity in order of the *Church*, and not of the *National* Church, that I am speaking. In the National Church this continuity might in fact be lost. That it was *not* so lost in the Church of England at the time of the Reformation forms the subject of special proceedings, which I must not anticipate.

But on one fact I would touch, which especially concerns the Old Catholic communities. The first Œcumenical Councils championed, as was stated, the autonomy of the organized provincial Churches, principally by forbidding the consecration of bishops for a strange province. If this prohibition is absolutely binding, the Old Catholics are Schismatics. Then the Episcopate of Holland had no right to consecrate an Old Catholic Bishop for Germany. But we must not overlook the fact that the second Œcumenical Council had already limited the rule about encroaching on no other diocese. The Council in fact declares in opposition to this rule. "The Churches of God in barbarian lands shall be governed according to the manner which already prevailed among the fathers." Hefele (ii. 17) refers—and certainly with reason—this exception to the newly founded Churches amongst nationalities which did not belong to the Roman Empire. Such Churches received

their first bishops as a matter of course from some provincial Church, and remained in a position of dependency in relation to this Church till such time as they were strong enough to become independent National Churches. The Council would have made an analogous exception in relation to lands where the believers were brought face to face with the alternative, either that they should agree to open heresies, or renounce the services of the bishops and priests of their own land.* In this case it can happen that the Community of a National Church in *order* must give up its connection with the hierarchy of its own land in order to remain in connection with the Catholic Church. But the decisive point is that she possesses the Catholic Episcopacy. If this is the case, she has also the continuity in order, even if she had only yesterday reached to an organization of her own, and an independent existence. The reproach that she has lost continuity in order—this reproach, as I think, a Church can best refute by the very fact that she regards the order as a possession which she shares with the Catholic Church, and that in granting the priesthood she remains faithful to the prescriptions of the Catholic Church.

(3)—A similar relation holds with the continuity in *doctrine*. In doctrine

---

* Quid igitur si noverit episcopus ecclesiam aliquam ministris necessariis et catholicis destitutam videns, neque huic populo esse proprium episcopum, qui presbyteros et necessarios ministros ordinet; quidni, inquam, poterit, imo teneretur, urgente ecclesiæ hujus necessitate, episcopalem suam auctoritatem et solicitudinem ad eam ecclesiam seu populum extendere, ei necessarios ministros ordinando? Quemadmodum parochus ob defectum proprii parochi vel presbyteri potest, quin et tenetur ultra limites propriæ parochiæ curam pastoralem alteri populo impendere.—Van Espen, Jus eccles. univers. tom. i. p. 440 (Magontiaci 1791). The question is answered in the affirmative, and the answer verified by many examples from the time of the fathers of the Church. Van Espen extracts from the examples mentioned by him the conclusion: Omnes igitur hi aliique vigilantissimi episcopi persuasissimum sibi habebant, officium episcopale ipsos obligare non tantum ad laborandum pro una particulari ecclesia, cui in sua ordinatione fuere adstricti, sed quod hoc officium universæ ecclesiæ deberent, ubi *necessitas vel charitas* id juxta leges christianæ prudentiæ exigeret.—(l.c. p. 441.) Scarcely any bishop of the first centuries was as zealous as S. Cyprian to preserve inviolate the unity and independence of the individual Church as represented in the bishop. And yet he too confessed that it was the duty of the Catholic Episcopate to support the believers in a Church whose duly elected and consecrated bishop failed to fulfil the duties of his office. When Marcian, Bishop of Arles, had passed over to the Novatians, Cyprian wrote to his "Brother" Stephen at Rome, appealing to Ezekiel xxxiv. 2 ff.: Cum ergo pastoribus talibus, per quos dominicæ oves negliguntur et pereunt, sic dominus comminetur, quid nos aliud facere oportet, frater carissime, quam colligendis et refovendis Christi ovibus exhibere diligentiam plenam et curandis lapsorum vulneribus paternæ pietatis adhibere medicinam . . . Nam etsi pastores multi sumus, unam tamen gregem pascimus et oves universas, quas Christus sanguine suo et passione quaesivit, colligere et fovere debemus nec pati supplices et dolentes fratres nostros crudeliter despici et superba quorumdam praesumptione calcari.—Ep. 68. Compare *Langen*, Geschichte der Roem. Kirche, i. p. 316. *Reinkens*, Die Lehre des heil. Cyprian von der Einheit der Kirche, p. 36 ff.; 45; 50 ff. It is quite in conformity with this view, which was already quite self-evident to S. Cyprian, when Febronius in his famous work, De statu ecclesiæ et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione Christianos compositus (Bullioni 1765), on the ground of many facts, says of the bishops of the ancient Church: Si quando periculum esset, ne fides vel haeresi subverteretur, vel, vexationibus destrueretur, nullus erat Episcoporum, qui non existimaret suarum partium esse, ut manum admoveat et pro quavis alia non minus quam pro propria sua diœcesi laboret. Diœceses ad bonum ordinem tempore pacis conservandum spectabant; fides autem res universalis erat, quæ cum oppugnaretur, universus orbis una tantum diœcesis et tota ecclesia unus grex habebatur (l. c. p. 158 seq.).

also a Catholic Church, so far as she will remain Catholic, may claim no autonomy, I mean no autonomy which confers on her the authority to *limit* the contents of the doctrine of faith according to her own good judgment, or to *widen* it in the same way. The guiding principle for every individual Church, as well as for the whole Catholic Church, is "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3); for on every individual and all bodies together the Lord's Word is binding, "One is your Master" (Matt. xxiii. 10), and "Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever" (Heb. xiii. 8). Even an angel from heaven would have no right to preach any other gospel unto us than the Apostles have preached unto us from the beginning (Gal. i. 8 ff.). That is what we shall also say, if we acknowledge the old rule of faith: Id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est; hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum. And only when a National Church confesses the Œcumenical Belief of the Œcumenical Church can she possess the true continuity in doctrine.

Yet, however, we may remark that in the last days of His life Jesus warned His disciples against the erroneous idea that they would be doing enough in taking heed not to *lose* the spiritual possession which they had received from the Lord (Luke xix. 11-28; Matt. xxv. 14-30). Every servant of the Lord receives a mina, each as much as the other, for each receives the whole. But this whole has a very different value according as the receiver labours to make it profitable. Amongst the servants of the Lord we may also understand the different Christian nations organized into Churches. If from fear of the austere Master a nation should confine its efforts to keeping intact the spiritual possession it has received, without taking the trouble to set it in circulation and turn it into the spiritual possession of many, so as to enrich them with religious and moral strength and promote their spiritual welfare; if a nation so acted it would be in no way better than that unprofitable servant who hid his mina in the napkin and dragged it about with him as a useless burden.

But this possession of the truth which has been given to us in Christ, we place at usury by well instructing youth, by diligently preaching God's Word, by holding in honour and cultivating theological wisdom, and by spreading publications from which the members of the nation can, according to their capacity, instruct themselves in sound doctrine.

But is this not dangerous? Will not this people, in consequence of spiritual activity in religious domains, wander into wrong ways, either wholly or in part, and just thereby lose the continuity in doctrine? This danger is indeed not excluded; but history teaches us that the danger of wandering into wrong ways, and thereby losing the continuity in doctrine, can exist also for an international ecclesiastical community as great as the Papal Church, that indeed it is even greater for such a community than for a National Church. I cannot imagine that a National Church would have had the courage to make the so-called dogma of the Immaculate Conception binding on the consciences of believers. No National Church would have put forth the clauses of the syllabus of the year 1864. or have promulgated the Vatican decrees of the year 1870. I do not even believe that a National Church would have ventured to append the anathema to sentences such as the Council of Trent has formulated. A National Church will always remain

conscious that she clothes eternal thoughts in human words, according to the limits of human power; she dares claim no infallibility, and she must be tolerant to all who acknowledge the teaching of the Saviour, Who says: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent" (S. John xvii. 3).

In this disposition a National Church will strive to find the fittest and most intelligible expression in her language about the eternal truth, but she will always be ready to improve this expression, or even abandon it altogether if it prove to be insufficient. S. Augustine went so far as to declare it as self-evident that a bishop's promulgations might be corrected by synods, and that the decisions of provincial synods were subject to the higher authority of the Œcumenical Councils, but that the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils must be corrected by subsequent Œcumenical Councils in the case where a truth that had hitherto been concealed came to light. (Quis nesciat . . . episcoporum litteras . . . per aliorum episcoporum graviorem auctoritatem doctioremque prudentiam et per concilia licere reprehendi . . . et ipsa concilia, quæ per singulas regiones vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati quæ fiunt ex universo orbe christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere, ipsaque plenaria saepe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, et cognoscitur quod latebat.—De Bapt. contra Donat. l. ii., n. 4.) In such a disposition as this, a National Church would, as it seems to me, preserve the continuity in doctrine, even if she should have had the misfortune to err in matters doctrinally accepted by her, just as I should not yet designate a preacher of the Church, who *intends* to proclaim God's Word, as a heretic, if his utterances have a false sense, or might have such.

But for protecting continuity in doctrine, there is in my opinion no better method than the liturgical expression of the doctrine. In the Liturgy as laid down by the Common Prayer-book, the Church confesses on every occasion of divine service her belief in the Apostolic and Œcumenical Church, renews her memory of the great facts of salvation, and ever again unites herself in spirit with the One Who has the words of eternal life, and with all who belong to the community of His believers. So long as a National Church has a Catholic Common Prayer-book and uses it, so long does she preserve and realize the continuity in doctrine.

So I cannot see any reason why a believing Christian should have any grounds to fear a National Church. Rather, on the contrary, an instructed Christian full of joyous confidence in the autonomy of the National Church, will confess his adherence to the third Œcumenical Council, and protest against the danger "that worldly ambitions creep in under the disguise of spiritual administration, and that we gradually lose the liberty which Jesus Christ, the Liberator of all men, has won for us at the price of His own Blood." A National Church is no thorn in the flesh of the nation, no imperium in imperio, but the heart which sends the blood of a sound, religious, and moral life into all the members of the body national. That the English nation is so sound and so powerful she owes to her sound heart, her sound National Church. And whether he be of the Western or the Eastern lands, whoever works in the building up of the National Sanctuary, serves his nation and serves his country.

(3) Its Continuity unbroken by the Reformation.

The Rev. H. M. Gwatkin, M.A., Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge.

If we are to discuss the question whether there was a breach of continuity in the Church of England at the Reformation, the first thing we have to do is to set aside our likes and dislikes of the Reformation, and deal with it simply as a question of fact. We have nothing to do with personal preferences in this paper. Now, the Reformed Church of England has always professed to be reformed only, not a new Church. Those then who say that there was a breach of continuity, are bound to prove their case. And this I think they cannot do.

It is not enough for them to say that great changes were made. The Reform Bill of 1832 was a great change; but nobody counts it a breach in the continuity of Parliament. The Church of Rome underwent a pretty complete change between Clement I. and Clement VII.; yet she is perfectly right in asserting her continuity. And now that she has settled to her own satisfaction the Pope's personal infallibility, that seems a firm bridge of continuity to anything whatever that a future pope may duly promulgate, though it were to canonize Henry VIII. and all his wives. Continuity allows of change to any extent—it only forbids revolutionary methods of change.

So far as I can see, there can be no breach of continuity in the Church of England, except in one of three ways. It may cease to be English, it may cease to be legal, or it may cease to be a Church of Christ at all.

First, it may cease to be English. There is really some case for treating the Norman Conquest as a breach of this kind; but at the Reformation there was nothing of the sort. The Germans who came in were fewer than the Italians who went out. It is hardly denied that the Church came out of the Reformation more English than it went in.

Secondly, it may cease to be legal. Changes may be made by violence instead of law. Cromwell's Church, for example, might possibly have become the Church of England; but it would have been as new as his dynasty. Now the Reformation settlement was strictly legal. Good or bad, every change was made in full legal form by the Crown in Parliament, which, as a matter of fact, has always been the sovereign legislature of the Church and State in England. If there is a breach of continuity, it is at any rate not a breach of law.

It remains to ask whether the Church of England ceased to be a Church of Christ at all. Let us begin with the definition laid down in our own articles. The visible Church of Christ is said to be first a congregation of faithful men. Well, we have not ceased to profess and call ourselves Christians. We never set up a goddess of reason, or denied our Lord, or burned our Bibles. Next, it is one where the pure word of God is preached—at least officially, for individuals may preach a very impure word of God in any church. At any rate, we have done our best to make the word of God our rule of preaching; and our enemies appear to think we have so far succeeded pretty well,

to judge from the taunt that we worship the Bible instead of the Church. Finally, the visible Church of Christ is one where the sacraments are duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that are of necessity requisite to the same; and it is undeniable that the Lord's two sacraments are duly ministered in the Church of England with the form and the matter which are all that he ordained. On this definition, I see no room for doubt that we are still a Church of Christ.

If it be too much to take for granted that we believe the Articles of our Church, we can go to work another way. Waiving the question of essentials, let us see what was actually done at the Reformation, and leave everyone to judge for himself. I am assuming, as in duty bound, that the Church before the Reformation was a true Church, in spite of its impure preaching and mutilated ministration of the Lord's Supper. The changes made were partly administrative, partly doctrinal. The great administrative change was the restoration to the king of his old power—the chief government of all estates of the realm—as in the time of William the Norman and the kings before him. And this led to further changes, chiefly the suppression of the monasteries, and the introduction of an English liturgy. The great doctrinal change was the absolute denial of all infallibility of Church or pope or council. This involved, on one side, the authority of every particular or national Church to make and alter rites and ceremonies without regard to any other Church; on the other the removal from our formularies of any current doctrines where Church authority was opposed to what would otherwise be the plain meaning of Scripture, like transubstantiation, masses, or the *ex opere operato* working of sacraments. These powers we have freely used, yet in these our doings we condemn no other nation, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only. Divine sanction we claim for all ordered government which is not contrary to Scripture; divine obligation for nothing that is not contained in Scripture, nor may be proved thereby.

This I think is a complete summary of the changes that were made. It may not cover all the details, but to the best of my memory it covers every change of importance. It was needless to raise any question, for example, of Apostolic succession; for it seems as certain as any historical fact can be that Warham and Barlow transmitted to Parker and Grindal any gift of that sort which they may have had, unless indeed we deny that they had any to transmit. And that is not a ground our Romish enemies are likely to take.

These, then, are the things which the Church of England has done. Whether they were wisely done is no present concern of ours. But the conclusion is that there was no breach of continuity at the Reformation, unless a Church which has done these things is no longer fit to be called a Christian Church; and that is an issue I leave to your own decision.

---

(4) What Was Done at the Reformation.

The Right Rev. John Wordsworth, D.D., Lord Bishop of Salisbury.

"Judge nothing before the time until the Lord come," are S. Paul's wise words in continuation of his remarkable utterances about the fire of

the last day, which shall try every man's work of what sort it is (1 Cor. iii. 12 foll., and iv. 5). History indeed may enable us to take a more connected view of what is past, to trace some results of actions, and to judge motives with less of prejudice and passion. But it does not permit us to give a final or complete decision on what was done at a particular epoch. Only when the whole tale of human life is unrolled can this be done, and then by Omniscience alone, which sees completely both the several and the particular issues, and gives every man his due reward.

> As He pronounces lastly on each deed,
> Of so much fame in Heaven expect thy meed.

Pending this, however, and having this caution in mind, we may ask ourselves the great question, "What was done at the Reformation?" Without attempting even to sketch a complete answer, we may pave the way for a provisional judgment upon it by remarking that it is capable of being considered in three different ways, each of which leads to a number of salutary thoughts.

I.—In the first place it may be considered as a necessary revolt against superstitions, corruptions, and usurpations in the Church—a revolt which was in its way as necessary and useful for the Roman as for the Anglican Church. It served the purpose of calling public attention to faults in Church life in a way that could not be overlooked. It was a brother's rebuke, though (as is often the case in family quarrels) not administered in as brotherly a manner as might have been desired. It was helpful and necessary to ourselves, as clearing us from present and future complicity with errors, and helpful to the pope as a manifest sign that he must set his house in order. Things have been better since, *on the whole*, both in morals and doctrine in the Western Church.

On the other hand, the separation of Anglican and Teutonic elements from the Latin races which have remained in communion with Rome, and the separation of the former into distinct, national, and local communions, has been a great misfortune for theology. It has left the Roman communion with far too little learning, and far too little respect for the individual conscience. It has turned the broader stream of theology into controversial channels, and the stream of training for the priesthood into narrow grooves. Systematic manuals, learnt by rote, have taken too much the place of a first-hand study of the Scriptures and the Fathers and later writers of the Church. Hence arose the grave dangers to Christendom of the time of Pius IX., when vain and scheming or over-enthusiastic persons were able to misuse the authority of the Latin Church to impose a heavy burden of new dogmas upon the consciences of the clergy, and such of the laity as had belief and knowledge enough to care for something besides peace. That we too have suffered, though in another way, is also evident, though it is less immediately apparent.

How far the manner in which the Reformation was carried out is culpable in the eyes of God, as depriving the rest of the Western Church of that share of learning and power of criticism which is possessed by the separated portions, and which might possibly have kept it straight and true in such dangers, it is not for us to decide. Certain it is that no utterance of a portion of the Church can have the power and wisdom

of the whole; and we are beginning to feel this, I believe, as a wholesome and unselfish stimulus to work for re-union, of course in a patient and prudent spirit. What a different tone and fulness and force would the pope's recent kindly appeal for unity have had, if it had been based upon experience of the truths which are fundamental with us, or even if he had a better knowledge of the feelings and habits of thought of those whom he was addressing!

II.—Secondly, "what was done at the Reformation" may be considered as a return to and a revival of primitive Christianity. As the Renaissance re-discovered the valuable elements of the old Greco-Roman culture, so the Reformation re-opened the treasures of the first and purest ages of the Church. This, at any rate, was the desire of the best and most representative of our English divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as it has been of those who have succeeded them. No one can read their writings without being convinced that it was a real and true motive.

I may refer those who wish to study this subject in a methodical way to a useful chapter in William Palmer's "Treatise on the Church of Christ" (vol. i., chap. vi.), headed "On the Principles of the English Reformation," in which he specially brings out "that the Catholic and primitive doctrine, and the authority of the Church of Christ, as opposed to modern abuses and to the licence of an unbridled private judgment, were the principles of the English Reformation" (page 493).

This desire reaches a sort of point in the well-known Canon for Preachers, passed in 1571: "Let preachers above all things be careful that they never teach aught in a sermon, to be religiously held and believed by the people, except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and which the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from that very doctrine." This is distinctly the line taken by such sober and learned writers as Hooker, Field, Crakanthorp, and Bramhall, to name but a few out of many who have written expressly in defence of our polity on what have been called Anglo-Catholic lines. The words of Bramhall are well-known to many of us. After describing the temper and attitude of mind of a true English Churchman, he says of him, in reference to the motto of his treatise taken from Pacian, "He may securely say 'My name is Christian, my surname Catholic.'" . . . "I make not the least doubt that the Church of England before the Reformation and the Church of England after the Reformation, are as much the same Church as a garden before it is weeded and after it is weeded is the same garden; or a vine before it is pruned and after it is pruned and freed from the luxuriant branches is one and the same vine"—("A Just Vindication of the Church of England from the Unjust Aspersion of Criminal Schism," Works A. C. L., vol i., pp. 112, 113, first published in 1654). He was possibly thinking of the conclusion of Crakanthorp's "Defence of the Church of England against the Archbishop of Spalatro," where he uses something of the same metaphors mixed with others taken from the passage of S. Paul with which I began my paper (cap. 85, p. 643, Lond., 1625).

But true as all this is, it is rather ideally than practically true. You cannot re-create the distant past or blot out the intermediate past. Nor has the Church of England ever been wholly in the hands of the

Anglo-Catholic party, or the mass of the people capable of understanding their principles. There have been hindrances to such a revival of primitive Christianity from the nature of the relations of Church and State, and from the nature and character of the people, both rich and poor, landowners, middle-class, artisans, and labourers. These hindrances have sometimes seemed very distressing and even oppressive; but I believe that God has intended them to stimulate us, in order that we might not settle down into a narrow society, content with a certain traditional discipline and ecclesiastical status, such as several bodies of Christians that we could name. God has, I believe, decided that we should have difficulties in regard to the past, in order that we might throw ourselves more forward into the future.

III.—This brings me to the third way of considering the Reformation. Those who may have heard (or possibly read) my sermon on Tuesday will have no difficulty in understanding this point of view. I believe that the most useful way of answering the question which I am desired to put to you, is by saying, "At the Reformation in England the way was prepared for exhibiting such a new type of Christianity as was necessary for the further development of the universal Church." The revolt against errors, and the return to primitive and Catholic truth, were both necessary—but mainly as the prelude to this higher and more world-wide mission. Without criticising Greek or Roman, Protestant or Reformed, we may say that the Anglican Church has a call to be something different from any of them, and for their sakes almost as much as for her own. If only we could realize the Lord's word when He was taking up His cross, "For their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth"! (John xvii. 19). We have work to do which they cannot do, which would otherwise be left undone, which our previous history and discipline, and our present opportunities, give us facilities for doing, and which no other Christian society can reach. It would be treason to the whole of Christendom to falter or turn back in this work.

The great English speaking communities call us to do and be our best—the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa; the Old Catholic Churches of the Continent call us; the orthodox and separated Churches of the East call us; Cyprus, Jerusalem, Assyria, Armenia, Egypt, call us; the Jews at home and abroad, who recognize our love for the Old Testament most like their own; even the Turks with whom we have fought side by side, the heathen of the great solid continents of Asia and Africa, and the many isles of ocean, call us. They tell us, wherever they can form and utter a voice, that a reformed and Catholic Church, giving their true position to the people, and striving to declare the whole counsel of God, with a priesthood that thinks more of its duties than its privileges, is what the Christian world needs. We have, through our special form of Reformation, with all and any defects it may have had, the essential basis of such a structure. Let none of us be wanting in the courage and the prudence, the self-denial and the love, that are necessary to help to build it up to the glory and praise of God.

The Rev. C. T. PORTER, D.D., Vicar of All Saints', Southport.

I COME from a diocese which has given a bishop and dean to the great East Anglian Diocese of Norwich; so that fact, I trust, will secure for me a patient and kindly hearing on the present occasion. I come from the Liverpool diocese, and if there is any other diocese in England requiring energetic bishops and deans, we shall be happy to supply them on the shortest possible notice. I sent in my card on the present occasion because I thought one might venture to emphasize, what many of us believe to be an invincible fact, viz.: that we are separated from the Church of Rome, not only by a great chasm as to organization and jurisdiction, but likewise by a great chasm as to doctrine as well. We ought to express our gratitude to previous Readers of papers, especially to the Bishop of Peterborough for the masterly paper in which he has clearly shown the rightful independence of the Church of England of the jurisdiction of any foreign bishop or foreign power whatsoever. But let us not forget, as we have been tempted to forget, that our difficulty with Rome is not merely one of ecclesiastical usurpation, but of difficulty as to doctrine. We got rid at the Reformation, not merely of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Roman pontiff, but we pitted against this solitary supremacy three other supremacies, and first of all the supremacy of the Word of God written. The Word of God written is the infallible source of truth. In 1870 we were informed that it was necessary to salvation that we should submit ourselves absolutely to one great interpreter of truth, and that anything he said *ex-cathedra* must be accepted, though it was against our own judgment as to what comes from the Word of God. The first thing done for us by the Reformation was the assertion of the supremacy of the Word of God as against the supremacy of any interpreter of it. This implies and involves the principle of the right of private judgment; but I may venture to suggest that as to the right of private judgment, Roman Catholics and ourselves are comparatively at one, at any rate in the outset, only we do not both go so far. We both act on private judgment in determining our choice of religion. Sir Wilfrid Lawson says that many people would prohibit the use of drink to all persons below, say, ten years of age, and that the only difference between him and them is, that he would prohibit it to all persons over ten years as well. The Roman Catholics by one supreme act of private judgment committed themselves blindly to the guidance of the Roman pontiff. But we decline to do that in favour of anyone whatsoever. The Reformation restored, then, the individual right of continued private judgment, and the supremacy of the written Word of God.

In the second place, it restored the independence of the individual conscience, and that takes us out of the category of those who have to follow father confessors, spiritual directors, etc. Under the system of the Church of Rome, the mind and conscience are acted upon through external authority by the leadership and guidance probably of some very fallible human being. The Reformation abolished this.

The Reformation restored to us, thirdly, the supremacy of faith in the matter of salvation. According to Luther, and according to the Bible, and our Articles, the doctrine of "justification by faith only" is the doctrine of a falling or standing Church. Now our Articles restored the doctrine to its right place, and this revolutionized the mediæval

conception of the ministry and the sacraments. The mediæval conception of the ministry was that of beings placed between the soul and God—an arrangement absolutely necessary to the safety of the soul. The Reformation restored to us the idea of immediate access, by an act of individual faith, to the help, strength, mercy, and pardon of the great High Priest Himself. In this way the Reformation, in its doctrinal aspect, gave us a trinity of supremacies as against the supremacy of the Church of Rome. We have to keep these things before us, because it is sometimes stated nowadays that our differences are not chiefly doctrinal, but that our doctrinal divergencies with the Church of Rome are comparatively trivial. That statement was made in a very able form many years ago, in "Tract 90," by the great Cardinal Newman, but the very author of that statement recognized that his own logic was at fault, by himself leaving his own Church for the Church of Rome, in which he died It is too late to tell us that our differences are merely those of jurisdiction and so forth, and not doctrinal. Our differences are doctrinal. Only two bridges can be built across the chasm separating us from Rome. Cardinal Vaughan says the alone bridge is the bridge of submission to the Roman pontiff. But there is another bridge; and this is the bridge of truth, across which the Church of Rome itself must march, to join the Church of England in common fidelity to the primitive and pure Christianity of the first ages of the Christian Church.

The Right Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

I AM not altogether surprised that only one card has been sent up, because we came here to-day, not so much to discuss as to listen and be instructed. If that was our object, I am sure it has been thoroughly attained. We have heard the whole subject considered from within, and we have had the exceptional advantage of seeing it treated in a friendly and brotherly spirit from without. It would be presumptuous for me as Chairman to endeavour to sum up so important and interesting a discussion. But I still come back to what was impressed on my own mind at the beginning. We have had the opportunity of study. It will be ours first to resolve, God helping us, that we will maintain that position which has been so plainly set before us, and next, to pray that God will enable us both to perceive and know what we ought to do, and also to have faith and courage to fulfil the same.

AGRICULTURAL HALL,

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 10TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF S. ALBANS in the Chair.

THE NATIONAL CHURCH—(*continued*).

THE WELSH DIOCESES.

(1) HISTORY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES.
(2) WORK AT THE PRESENT TIME.
(3) PROPOSED DISESTABLISHMENT AND DISENDOWMENT.
(4) PAROCHIAL ORGANIZATION OF CHURCH DEFENCE.

PAPERS.

The Ven. DAVID RICHARD THOMAS, F.S.A., Archdeacon of Montgomery; and Canon Residentiary of S. Asaph.

THERE are many reasons why the more general subject of "The National Church," treated of this morning, should be followed up by that of the "Welsh Dioceses;" for

(1) They represent, in unbroken succession, the oldest portion of that Church;

(2) They exhibit peculiarities of race, language, and treatment which deserve special consideration;

(3) They have had to stand in the van and bear the force of the agitation against the whole principle of an established and endowed Church; and

(4) The aims and methods of that agitation stand out as a timely and instructive warning to every part of the National Church.

The four dioceses of Llandaff, S. David's, Bangor, and S. Asaph, date their origin from the sixth century; their founders, Dyfrig, Dewi, Deiniol, and Cyndeyrn, were contemporaneous, and all lived within a period of one hundred years. The question, therefore, at once arises, What had been the organization and form of the Church previously? and what causes led to this simultaneous development?

The wide extent of the subject to be handled, and the narrow limitation of time, forbid any discussion of the unsettled questions, as to the exact date, agency, and methods of the introduction of Christianity into this country; it will suffice to begin with an undisputed fact.

In the year 314 was held the *Council of Arles*—at which there were present three bishops from Britain, with Sacerdos a Presbyter, and Arminius a deacon—itself an evidence that the Church they represented was held to be orthodox in the faith, and duly organized in its polity. The very names are recorded of the bishops and their sees: Eborius of Eboracum, Restitutus of London (or Lincoln), and Adelfius of Caerleon-on-Usk, the chief cities of the three Roman provinces into which Britain

was divided. The marvellous organization of the Roman Empire, her military system, by which her legions embodied distant nationalities and made her stations in a measure cosmopolitan, the security afforded by her walled towns, the facility of communication provided by her network of roads, and the wide prevalence of her language, as the official medium of many races, offered a splendid field for the spread of Christianity; and it is exactly what we should expect to find, that those bishops should come from such favourable centres.

But when it is argued that they were the bishops only of the Roman occupation, and that there was no British or native Church in existence at this time, nor until the next century, we must demur strongly to such an inference. For if the Church is not self-propagating, she is nothing; and there is no just ground for treating as mere rhetoric the witness of Tertullian, even a hundred years earlier, A.D 208, that there were "*Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita.*" (H. & S. i. 3.) Such a theory, moreover, makes it more than ever difficult to understand the facts of the succeeding history. Nay, the very names are suggestive, though in Latin garb they are not therefore necessarily Roman. "Eborius" is but the Latin form of Ifor, and "Eboracum" of "yr Efrawc"=the Goatland; "Restitutus" is Rhystid; all of them Welsh words; "Adelfius" has a Greek sound, and "Arminius" Latin, while "Sacerdos" is rather another aspect of Presbyter than a personal name.

Whether British Bishops attended the council of Nicea, A.D. 325, is uncertain; they certainly accepted and adhered to its decrees. But there is no uncertainty about their presence at Ariminum in A.D. 349; for three of them in their poverty accepted the imperial allowance at the hands of Constantine, who was indeed their countryman, and the first of the Christian Emperors.

Before the end of the century we have the frequent witness of S. Chrysostom, A.D. 386; and of S. Jerome, A.D. 378; and of Sozomen (*c.* A.D. 443), that there was a settled Church in Britain, with churches, altars, Scriptures, discipline, holding the Catholic Faith, and having intercourse both with Rome and Palestine." (H. & S. i. 10.)

A sore trial of their faith and constancy, however, soon arose; for the Pelagian heresy was introduced, took speedy root, and spread widely; indeed its chief propagator, if not its author, was a Welshman, Morgan (Latinized into Pelagius), and that in part accounts for its rapid growth. An urgent appeal was made to the Gallican Church for help, and their Synod deputed two learned, eloquent, and holy bishops, Germanus and Lupus, to this office. The close affinity of the two dialects, the Gallic and the Welsh of that period, rendered their selection the more appropriate; and Constantine, in his *Life of Germanus*, informs us, that vast crowds gathered around them to hear their sermons and counsels; to whom they preached, not only in the churches, but also in the highways, the fields, and in out of the way places. A second visit of Germanus followed about eighteen years later, when the heresy was practically repressed; and from the high repute in which his memory was held in Wales, in Cornwall, and the Isle of Man, and the many churches that bear his name in North Wales, we seem to trace the very course he followed in his journey. For these churches are not spread indefinitely about the country; but follow well ascertained lines of

communication from S. Harmon on the borders of Radnorshire, to the country of Yale, and from Yale to Lleyn in Carnarvonshire.

Before the departure of the Romans, two branches of the Celtic race inhabited the area with which we have now to deal, the Brythonic and the Goidelic; *i.e.*, the Britons and the Gaels, the former occupying the central and northern portions, and the latter the western coasts and the south; and both branches were Christian.

When the Saxons, in their successive invasions, pressed the Britons ever westward and northward, they did not exterminate them, but reduced those that remained to the condition of slaves and serfs; and they cut them off from the Britons of Cumbria in the north and from those of Cornwall and Devon in the south. This enforced pressure westward did not, however, wholly dislodge the Goidels on the west, between whom and their advanced body in Ireland there was kept up close and frequent intercourse, social and religious.

But when the Picts and Scots in their turn pressed upon the Britons of Cumbria, these latter, under the leadership of Cunedda Wledig and his sons, took possession of north and central Wales, and finally drove out the main body of the Goidels. A great spur was given by Cunedda's family to Christian missions, and he is handed down as the head of one of the three holy families of Britain. Another of these was Brychan, an Irishman, who, with his family of holy men and women, did the like faithful service in Brycheiniog and the South. With them it may be said began the special "age of the Welsh saints," and the characteristic of their operation was the monastic, or, rather, collegiate method; they lived in community and worked from a centre, and not as individual missionaries. Of this we have later evidence in the great extent of the older mother parishes, which were generally co-extensive with lordships or manors, and whose endowments consisted of a number of portions.

Another type of saints, the Hermits, who occupied the islands on the coast, such as Priestholm, Holyhead, Bardsey, and Caldy, and some desert places (Disserth) on the mainland, I need not discuss, as they hardly affect the question of dioceses. The bishops lived in the collegiate houses, exercising, indeed, their spiritual functions independently, but subject in other matters to the head of the house, as was the case in Ireland. These heads were generally related to the local chieftain, and, indeed, the portions, if not given with that view originally, came in time to be regarded as family provisions. The tribal system, in fact, closely affected all the conditions of life, social and ecclesiastical, in Church and State. Thus we find the four dioceses representing each a kingdom; *i.e.*, Bangor = Gwynedd; S. Asaph = Powys; S. David's = Dyfed; and Llandaff = Gwent; a family chain linking together their founders; thus S David, S. Teilo of Llandaff, and Maelgwn Gwynedd (the founder of the two North Welsh sees), were all of the race of Cunedda; Deiniol of Bangor and Asaph of the family of Coel Godebog; and Dyfrig of Llandaff of the line of Brychan. To these sees must be added others, such as Caerleon, Margam, Llanbadarn, also representing Morganwg and Ceredigion, but subsequently absorbed, kingdom and diocese alike, in the two southern survivors.

In the bitter "Increpations" of Gildas, which belong to this period, we seem to read the denunciations of one who fiercely opposed this

new order of things, and who held up the kings of Britain, the bishops, priests, and deacons, to scornful reproof; not, as he admits, because they were all bad, but because some of them were so; and he singles out especially Maelgwn, the temporal founder of Bangor and S. Asaph, and Vortiper, the temporal founder of S. David's.

When Augustine came, at the end of the sixth century, to convert the heathen Angles and Saxons, he found, apparently to his surprise, a Christian Church already established and fully organized; and it must have been orthodox, otherwise he would not have invited its co-operation on such simple conditions as the change of three or four non-essential customs. Those customs, however, involved for them questions of national importance. The observance of Easter, "the complement of baptism," and the tonsure, had a long and venerated prescription. In their Easter they adhered to the decree of the Council of Arles; the much disputed "complement of baptism" may have related to trine immersion, or to the use of Chrism, or to the minister by whom, or even the time of Confirmation. The tonsure, which their opponents nicknamed after Simon Magus, was a memorial of their adoption of the Christian faith in the place of that of the ancient Druidic Magi. It was not, however, the things themselves they objected to, so much as the subordination of their own rights to "the customs of the holy Roman and Apostolic Church." It was, in fact, the claim which we have just seen renewed in the latest Roman Pastoral, that put a stop to the Conference and the proposed union. *Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia*, the Britons were prepared to accept; but they would not read into it *sola ecclesia*, or adopt the corollary, *Ubi Jacobus, aut Johannes, aut Paulus, ibi non ecclesia.* As interpreted by Bede, this refusal to co-operate involved them in the fearful slaughter of Bangor, by way of retribution. But it is not true that the Britons refused altogether to convert the Saxons, though they did long continue, like the Irish Bishop Daganus, to refuse friendly intercourse with the Saxon bishops; for it was, after all, through the missions from the North of Aidan and Finnan, of Diuma and Cedd and Chad, that the greater part of England was converted; and that, when the Roman Mission had, in part at least, collapsed. And the reason of their success is simple; they appealed as brethren in blood and language to the great mass of their countrymen, who had been reduced to servitude by the Saxons, and they touched a chord in their hearts which the Italians failed to move.

Of the history of the Welsh dioceses from this period we have little real information. We know little of the copious lists of bishops of S. David's and Llandaff beyond their names; some of them were most likely contemporary bishops in the absorbed sees. Of those in the two northern dioceses we have not even a list. We are only told that Elvod of Bangor adopted the Roman Easter about the end of the eighth century, but that the bishops of Llandaff and S. David's refused to concur; and that this led to an invasion of South Wales by the Saxons. Following on this, we find that Wales in 816 was subject to the supremacy of Egbert, and that before the end of the century South Wales bishops were consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and that a Saxon prelate occupied S. David's.

How long this lasted we know not; but early in the next century, A.D. 928, Howel the Good, King of all Wales, summoned a

council of laymen and clerics from all parts to Whitland, in Carmarthenshire, to codify the laws. There came together, besides six of the wisest laics from every Commote, seven score croziers, archbishops, and bishops, and teachers and abbots and priors. Twelve of the wisest of these men were selected; and the laws drawn up by them threw a flood of light on the ecclesiastical and civil history of the country, and of the relations of Church and State.

The large number of croziers—seven bishops' houses (seith escobty) are enumerated in Dyfed alone—shows how important a position the Church held; and we find many regulations defining the rights, privileges, endowments, and duties of the clergy; the precedence and privileges of the royal chaplains (the priest of the household); the provision for subdividing cures, and the proportion of tithes to be assigned to the new and the mother churches; the privileges of sanctuary; the regulation of church suits; the division of fines between the abbot and the priest, and between the bishop and the king; the enfranchisement of villein townships through the erection of a church with burial ground; the division of the fabric into chancel and nave; the altar, holy water, relics; the three principal festivals; the difference between the ecclesiastical and the civil law with respect to inheritance, the former making the eldest son, the latter the youngest, to be heir; and how at seven years of age the child passed under the hand of the confessor or director, and at fourteen was brought to his lord, fixing apparently the time of his Confirmation and coming of age. It might be supposed that this implied endowment as well as establishment by the State, but the principle laid down is significant on this point: "The Law is not closed for *Church land*, at any time among themselves, for it did *not emanate from our law*." (Book II., cxi. 55).

These laws were finally taken to Rome, compared with the code of other Christian countries, and approved by the Pope (Anastasius); showing the primacy of honour in which the Roman Pontiff was held as the virtual head of Western Christendom. In this mission the Bishops of Bangor, S. David's, and S. Asaph took part, together with Blegwryd, Archdeacon of Llandaff, as scribe or secretary.

Before we pass on to the period of complete absorption, ecclesiastical and political, it may be convenient to note some of the peculiarities of the native Church, besides those already mentioned. From the large quotations in the *Epistle of Gildas*, it is evident that it possessed a special Latin version of the Bible, differing from the Vulgate; but there is no evidence to prove that there was any Welsh version of either the Old or the New Testament. Nor do we know whether they had the Liturgy in the vernacular; but some distinctive features of it have been pointed out, such as a multiplicity of collects in the ritual of the Mass; the consecration of a bishop by a single bishop; the anointing of the hands of deacons and priests at their ordination; the fast of forty days before the consecration of a church, and its dedication after the name of its founder; the reckoning of the second half of the Christian year from Trinity, and not, as in the Roman Church, from Pentecost or Whitsuntide. It had its own native terms for prayer, praise, thanksgiving, worship, and churchyard (Gweddi, Mawl, Diolch, Addoliad, Llan); while its detail terminology was derived of necessity from either the Latin (as Pylgain, Gosper, Llith, Offeiriad, offeren, allor, canghell, Sul, Gwyl,

Nadolic, Ystwyll, Garawys), or through Gaul and Ephesus from the Greek (as Esgob, Diacon, Eglwys, Pasg). It may be added that the marriage of priests was the custom, although an ineffectual attempt had been made to suppress it.

The brief notices of some of the bishops in the succeeding century serve to illumine the history of that period, which we may describe as the closing days of the independence of the British Church.

Of Bledri, Bishop of Llandaff, who died A.D. 1022, it is recorded that "he so much loved knowledge that he required every priest to support instruction from literary works in his Church, that everyone might know his duty to God and man."

Of Joseph, his successor, A.D. 1030, that he "ordered that no work or occupation should take place on the Sundays and Holy Days, and obliged the priests to teach, to read the Holy Scriptures without payment or gift, and to abandon controversies;" and on his death, A.D. 1046, that he was "a very wise, learned, and godly man; that he instituted good order on the Saints' Days; that prayer to God, showing good works, almsgiving, proper remembrance of God and His saints and their praiseworthy works, should alone take place."

Of Sulien, of S. David's, A.D. 1088, we read that he was "the wisest and most praiseworthy of all the bishops in Wales, and the best for counsel, learning, religion, and defence of peace and justice."

And of his son, Rhyddmarch (Rhygyfarch), that he was "one without an equal or second, excepting his father, for learning, wisdom, and piety; and after him instruction for scholars ceased at Menevia" (S. David's).

The Norman Conquest, while it overwhelmed England in its flood, affected Wales also, directly and surely. The Lords Marchers, to whom the Conqueror gave authority to seize what they dared, and keep what they could, of the Principality, soon planted themselves in strong castles along the Marches or Borders, and even pushed inwards into the heart of Glamorgan, Brecknock, Cardigan, and Flint. Their policy here, as in England, was to replace wherever they could the secular clergy, alike in the parish churches and in the monasteries, with others favourable to their interests; and to establish new Orders in their midst, to whom they were wont to appropriate the great tithes of their parishes; and sometimes they assigned them to distant abbeys in England.

This weakening of the parochial influence, which was eminently national, and the planting of Cistercians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Augustinians, amenable to the Pope, but not subject to the diocesan bishops, introduced a foreign element which greatly affected the position of the National Church, and ultimately led to the Reformation. In the twelfth century, Norman bishops had been placed in every Welsh See.

And it is a remarkable sequence of their policy, followed largely through the next seven centuries, that whilst in Bangor, out of fifty-eight bishops down to 1890, only twenty were Welshmen; in S. Asaph, out of sixty-five down to 1870, only twenty-four; whilst in S. David's, out of sixty down to 1874, only thirteen were natives; and in Llandaff, down to 1883, out of sixty, only nine.

In 1188, Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, visited Wales for the

professed purpose of preaching the Crusades; and, being honourably received, he, robed in full vestments, celebrated mass in each of the four cathedrals, which was described by his chronicler as a visible entering into possession—*tanquam investiture cujusdam signum.* On this occasion, he was attended by Giraldus Cambrensis, Archdeacon of Brecon, as his chaplain and interpreter, to whom we are indebted for a graphic account of the journey, and a description of the manners and customs of the people. This remarkable man was a resolute upholder of the rights, or what he believed to be the rights, of his Church. He not only withstood Adam, Bishop of S. Asaph, and rescued the jurisdiction of Kerry for S. David's, but he strenuously, and at great sacrifice of time and money, championed the claim of that see to Metropolitan authority. There is, however, no sufficient evidence to prove that such a claim had any real foundation. Whatever pre-eminence it had exercised must have been rather that of *primus inter pares*, than one of local precedence; and this itself depended in great measure on the relative power of the respective Welsh princes, for the title of archbishop was applied at different times to Llandaff and Bangor. Indeed we rather suspect that his zeal in this cause was not altogether unaffected by his personal ambition, for he had set his heart on the See of S. David's. At all events he joined willingly Archbishop Baldwin in his "visitation" of the Welsh dioceses, and appears to have acquiesced without a protest in his somewhat high-handed proceedings. At Bangor, he tells us that the archbishop ordered the body of Owen Gwynedd, Prince of North Wales, who had been buried before the high altar, to be removed out of the church, because he had been "excommunicated by the blessed martyr, S. Thomas, on account of his public incest with his cousin-german." He had married his first cousin Anne, the daughter of Grono ap Edwyn, and refused to put her away, though within the prohibited degrees. Again, at Shrewsbury, he excommunicated Owen de Cyfeiliog, who was "conspicuous for the good government of his country, because he alone amongst the Welsh princes did not come to meet the archbishop with his people."

In the final struggle between Llewelyn, the last native Prince of Wales, and Edward I., we find that this terrible instrument of excommunication was often wielded against the Welsh Prince; and even after the annexation of the Principality, Archbishop Peckham, in his injunctions to the Welsh bishops, A.D. 1284, after enumerating details of dress, and habit, and ceremonial, and organization, which he calls upon them to assimilate to those of the English, adds a warning that, failing their obedience, the Roman Church would, in the last resort, summon a crusade to enforce it. *Romana ecclesia cruci si oporteret exercitu invocato; contra quos vires Walliæ nihil possent.*

No doubt State policy regarded it as imperative for the common peace and well-being that Wales should no longer remain independent, and a source of recurring danger; and Welsh jealousies, feuds, and civil rivalries made it inevitable that, sooner or later, annexation must take place. Ecclesiastically, too, it was desirable that those who were one in creed and communion should be as little divided as possible in rites and customs. But they were evil days all the same, when Canterbury and Rome in turns threw their weight into the Edwardian scales.

Still, when once the fusion took place, there was due consideration made, at least in the two Northern Sees, for Welsh needs and interests. Several of the succeeding bishops were natives; and during this time the breviary was translated into the vernacular by Dafydd Ddu Hiraddug, Vicar of Tremeirchion. Whether it was ever used in the public service, we know not; there was no corresponding translation of any book of the Holy Scriptures. The rising of Owen Glyndwr in 1400, and the support given to his cause by Dean Daron of Bangor, and later on by Bishop Trevor of S. Asaph, were followed by a harsh and oppressive policy in the treatment alike of the Welsh Church and the Welsh people, a policy that was not modified until the accession of the House of Tudor, itself of Welsh origin. The ban under which Welshmen had lain was removed by Henry VII., under whose sympathetic rule a new era dawned. But it was with the Reformation that the full light shone forth. Eminent natives were appointed to the Welsh Sees; the Liturgy, the New Testament, and the Old Testament, were successively translated into the vernacular; the chief workers in these were Bishop Richard Davies, William Salesbury, a learned lawyer, Dr., afterwards Bishop, William Morgan, Bishops Vaughan and Parry, Dean Goodman, Archdeacon Prys, and Dr. John Davies, the grammarian and lexicographer. But the main cost of publishing the Bible was borne by Archbishop Whitgift. The effect of all this was not only to enable Welshmen to worship and to study the Sacred Word in their own mother tongue, but to rescue the language itself from the oblivion which has befallen the Irish, and to raise it to a high and fixed classical standard. Education also was eagerly promoted; the grammar schools of Ruthin, Bangor, Cowbridge, Llanrwst, were founded and endowed. Jesus College was established at Oxford, with a view to the education of clergy for the Church in Wales; and the parochial clergy were required to be diligent in catechizing the young "every Sonday yn the mother tongue."

There were, no doubt, many irregularities to be corrected, no little ignorance to be dispelled, and not a few scandals alleged against the new order; but, bearing in mind the circumstances of the time, it was a period of bright awakening and good promise.

From this time onwards the Welsh and English dioceses have shared a common fortune, through the troubles of the Commonwealth and the comparative sleep of the eighteenth century, but with some specialities in the case of the Welsh dioceses. The Puritan spirit, imbibed by the Reformers at Geneva, did not affect Wales until long after England; and it was not till 1639 that the first Dissenting (Independent) Congregation was established at Llanfaches, in Monmouthshire. But, with the Commonwealth a new method was adopted; in 1649 an Ordinance of Parliament was passed for the better "Propagation of the Gospel in Wales." Seventy-two commissioners were appointed to "deprive" clergymen and schoolmasters, if found to be delinquent, scandalous, malignant, or non-resident, and to manage the confiscated funds, and twenty-five ministers to act as "approvers," and appoint six itinerant teachers to supply their place in each county. These "approvers" consisted of Presbyterians, Independents, and Anti-Pædo Baptists, and one of the most active among them was Vavasor Powell, who had been ordained as curate of Clun, afterwards turned

Independent, then Anti-Pædo Baptist; with his spiritual functions he combined the office of captain of a troop of horse under Major-General Harrison; but being a hot Republican, and a Fifth-Monarchy man, he was obnoxious to Cromwell, and by him imprisoned. With "approvers" of this type to test the new ministers, and with "commissioners" who considered such charges as "bowing at the name of Jesus," "refusing to contribute to the rebellion," "preaching against the doctrine that the greatest part of the world would be damned," and asserting that of "universal grace" to be sufficient ground for deprivation, almost all the clergy were turned adrift; and men of any orders, or of no orders, provided they pronounced the right shibboleth, were sent about the country to propagate the new gospel of Calvinism. And so Dissent was established and enforced in Wales by an Ordinance of Parliament. Even so, however, it did not greatly thrive. Petitions were sent up from many districts praying for redress from the benighted condition to which they had been reduced; and when the Restoration was brought about, it met with a cordial welcome. Those of the old clergy who had survived were replaced in their cures, and such of the new men as submitted to the Church's system and orders were allowed to retain possession; but one witness still testifies to the injury wrought for all time by that irregular interregnum. Few of our parochial registers escaped destruction, and of those that have been preserved very few have the entries for that time filled in.

At the beginning of the last century, in 1715, there were seventy-one Dissenting Pastoral charges, with above one hundred and ten distinct congregations in the thirteen counties; but of these only seven, with fifteen congregations, were in the North Welsh dioceses. The bulk of them were in the counties of Monmouth, Glamorgan, and Carmarthen. The parish churches at that time were fairly well filled, and the communicants numerous; at Easter they were counted by hundreds in the larger parishes. The movement which had been set on foot at the end of the preceding century to supply Bibles, Common Prayer, and devotional books in Welsh, and to instruct the young more fully in English, had done much to elevate and benefit the people; and this was followed up by the institution in 1730 of circulating schools by the Rev. Griffith Jones, Vicar of Llanddowror. The great purpose of these schools was to teach the young and the old to read the Bible and the Prayer-book, and to learn the Church Catechism in their mother tongue; their field of operation was the small and the poor out-of-the-way parishes not otherwise provided for, and they were moved about from parish to parish after an interval of six, or twelve, or eighteen months, under the supervision of the clergy. So successful was this system, that within fifteen years of Vicar Jones' death some three hundred thousand men, women, and children had learnt to read.

This was a time, moreover, of religious awakening, when such men as Daniel Rowlands of Llangeitho, Howell Harries, and others, laboured indefatigably to arouse a new spiritual life in the country. But owing to an unsympathetic and misguided policy on the part of the authorities of the day, this movement, fraught with great possibilities, was allowed to drift into another, and an adverse, channel. The last Welshman appointed to a Welsh see was John Wynne to S. Asaph in 1715, and he was removed in 1727 to Bath and Wells.

No doubt the Welsh sees, like the Welsh parishes, were poorly endowed, and many of them, especially in South Wales, grievously impoverished through the Dissolution; but not poorer than in the preceding century; and now they came to be treated, not as fields for a life's labour, but as stepping stones to higher and more lucrative honours. Thus, in Llandaff, there were, in the eighteenth century, eleven changes; in S. Asaph, fourteen; in Bangor, thirteen; and in S. David's, as many as seventeen. From 1716 to 1870 not a single Welshman was placed in a Welsh see. So that during the revival of religious life within the Church, there was a want of sympathy and guidance on the part of the chief pastors. The learning of Bull and the piety of Beveridge were forgotten, the heterodoxy of Hoadley was remembered; the absenteeism of Watson, and the nepotism of Warren, and Shipley, and Luxmoore remained as object lessons. It may have been just as bad in England, but two evils do not make a virtue anywhere. The system was bad, for it greatly discouraged the clergy, who saw too often the higher honours and the best sinecures given to those who had "friends at court," and themselves, who did the real work, ignored; while it alienated the laity and added force to the new movement, which had sprung, indeed, within the Church, but was not, as it might have been, guided as a handmaid in her cause. So long as the Welsh Church was treated with sympathy and just consideration, none were more loyal than the Welsh people to the Church and the Crown; but for one hundred and fifty years no monoglot Welshman ever heard his bishop ministering Sacrament or Confirmation in the language understanded of the people. Under such conditions, *facilis descensus*, and we wonder it has not been even worse; *Sed revocare gradum* has been a painful and protracted process; but, thank God, it has been going on steadily and hopefully for the last fifty years. Pluralities have been abolished, and absenteeism ended; parsonage houses rebuilt by aid of Queen Anne's Bounty, and sinecures applied to the increase of needy vicarages and the endowment of new cures; a vast change been introduced into South Wales dioceses; and the long-neglected claims of the Church to a native Episcopate conceded; and for this last step, all honour to the "Grand Old Man."

---

(2) Work at the Present Time.

The Ven. David Howell, B.D., Archdeacon of Wrexham and Canon of S. Asaph.

My subject is the present work of the Church in Wales. Church work is visible and invisible. The best, most real, and most durable Church work is not found in Year Books, nor can it be tabulated in statistics. The greatest work and the greatest workers are often the least observed. The ten days of united prayer which preceded the Day of Pentecost was a far greater spiritual power than all the ceremonialism of the Jewish Church. This applies to all spiritual work. The most and best of it is unseen by any eye but that of God.

What I have to bring before you on this occasion is the present visible work of the Church in Wales. But how imperfect and inadequate

a view of that work is it possible to compress into an address of twenty minutes.

Moreover, so brief a sketch has the further disadvantage that, in the absence of qualification and explanation, it gives to what is said an air of optimism, which a fuller statement of the case might hardly justify, and when what is only true of parts is taken as true of the whole. Not only so, but of necessity it leaves out of account the work which others are doing, a point of real importance if we are to take a just view of the religious condition of Wales.

But without further preface, let me say that the work which the Church is now doing in Wales will bear an all-round comparison with the work of the Church in England. In the number of confirmees and communicants in proportion to the population, in the amount spent in the building and restoration of churches and mission-rooms, in the increase of clergy and the multiplication of services—in these and other tokens of Church work and progress, the Church in Wales will bear comparison with the Church in England generally, and a very favourable comparison with some of the English dioceses. This statement will doubtless be a surprise to some of my hearers. You have been so accustomed to hear the Church in Wales spoken of as a weak Church, that you are rather surprised to be told that you need our sympathy at least as much as we need yours. That I am speaking advisedly will be seen from the fact that, while the percentage of communicants to the population in England is 5·8 per cent., the percentage in the four Welsh dioceses is 6·7 per cent. In other words, for every five Church communicants in England, there are six in Wales; and it is further worthy of observation that whilst the percentage of communicants in the diocese of Llandaff, which is the most Anglicized of the four Welsh dioceses, is not quite 5·2 per cent., in the diocese of S. David's it is over 8·6 per cent.; in the Archdeaconry of Cardigan, the most Welshy Archdeaconry in that diocese, it exceeds 11 per cent.; and is very little under 10 per cent. in the Archdeaconries of Brecon and S. David's.

"But," you will ask, "if such is the case, how comes it that so considerable a portion of the people of Wales are eager to disestablish the Church?" The answer is not far to seek. "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." The traditions of past generations of neglect and mismanagement linger long, and die slowly. Nothing is gained by minimizing and ignoring the shortcomings of the past; but neither is it fair nor just to the present generation to dwell unduly upon them. It should not be forgotten that in Wales political forces are much more active and aggressive than they are in England; that the Church has been associated in the minds of the people with the interests of the ruling classes, and the principles of one political party, to a far greater extent in Wales than in England; that the difference in language, social habits, political sympathies, and religious ideas between the higher and lower classes in Wales has tended to alienate these classes to an extent hardly known in England. There is also the influence of the vernacular press, the impression that the Church is unfriendly to Welsh nationality, the political awakening of the last twenty-five years, and, not least, the love of change which has always been a characteristic of the Celtic race from the day when S. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Galatians to the present day. Moderation

has little charm to a Welshman, nor does neutrality find a place in his vocabulary. In England aggrieved parishioners mostly drift into indifference; in Wales they promptly provide for themselves, and an irreparable breach is the result. How far the inefficiency, unspirituality, autocracy, and want of sympathy on the part of us clergy may have contributed to the present condition of things, God only knows, and may He graciously forgive!

But I must not further detain you with the causes which have led to the present attitude of many of my countrymen towards the Church as an Establishment. Far more agreeable to my feelings is it to dwell on the revived life of the Church, and its manifold activities. The four Welsh dioceses in 1831 contained 843 benefices; at the present time there are more than 1,000; in 1831 there were 683 clergy, in 1895 there are more than 1,500. The average net income of each incumbent is about £185; and I need hardly say there must be a considerable number under such value to constitute such an average. The total net clerical income from all sources in 1894 was £186,046 4s. 1d., and the total amount of voluntary contributions for Church work was £240,643 4s. 2d. It will thus be seen that the voluntary contributions of Welsh Churchmen exceeded the net clerical income by £54,597 0s. 1d. The piety of the pocket is not a bad test of religious sincerity, as men are not usually given to pay for what they do not care for. In the matter of elementary education, the Church is doing a truly noble work. In the four Welsh dioceses there are 1,647 elementary schools. Of these 852, or more than one-half of the whole, are voluntary schools, and of these again 703 are Church of England schools. In the year 1846, when the population of Wales was only a little over a million, the Church, without assistance from the State, was educating nearly 50,000 children in Wales. The contributions of Welsh Churchmen towards elementary education between 1811 and 1892 amounted to nearly two and a quarter millions sterling; and at this present time, while paying their share towards the expenses of School Boards, they contribute about £25,000 a year towards their own schools, in which nearly 75,000 of the poor children of Wales are being "brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." And here let me say, that to my mind it is hardly possible to over-estimate the importance of religious instruction in our voluntary schools in Wales at the present time. In a Parliamentary paper recently published a return is made of the 2,392 School Boards which existed in England and Wales on April 1st, 1894. Of this number, there were 57 which made no provision for religious reading, teaching, or observances of any kind; and out of the 57, no less than 50 are in Wales. Now let me say at once that I am not hostile to School Boards in themselves, when and where imperatively required; nor am I insensible to the splendid services rendered to Wales by her Sunday Schools; and never were those schools carried on with greater zeal and vigour that at the present time. But I should be false to my convictions if I did not declare that I can hardly conceive a graver calamity to a country than 50 School Boards from whose schools the Word of God is excluded. In this I have reason to believe that I am expressing the sentiments of an increasing number of Nonconformists, who feel that, at a time when nearly one-third of the whole population of the Principality is said to be outside all religious ministrations, there

are far greater issues involved, to the welfare of society and the future of Wales, than the differences of Church and Dissent. My countrymen are not unreasonable when reasonably dealt with, and I cannot but believe that, if this matter were placed fairly before them, they would not be slow to remove what I cannot but regard as a terrible reproach to what is unquestionably one of the most Bible-loving nations in the world. A question which has to a considerable extent been already solved in the School Boards of the great towns and cities of England, cannot surely be insoluble in such a country as Wales. "Sirs, ye are brethren."

The Church Extension work of the Church in Wales demands special mention. About the middle of the present century, or nearly fifty years ago, the Church in Wales found herself beset by almost unexampled difficulties. Her cathedrals, if not in ruins, were in a state of deplorable dilapidation. Her parish churches by hundreds were only too true pictures of her moral and spiritual decay. The wretched little deal communion tables were such as would hardly have found a place in the poorest cottages; while the dirty and moth-eaten altar cloths would have found a place in few, if any, human dwellings. Roofs full of holes. seats rotten, grass growing in the porches, shovels, spades, planks, and biers exposed; common basins used for fonts; celebrations, such as they were, few and far between; the services irreverently gabbled over; no responses, except by the clerk, who was not always the most reputable person in the parish; often no singing; and the preaching, as a matter of course, in character with all besides. All this have I personally seen and known in the latter years of the first half of the present century, and that when Welsh Nonconformity was in the full tide of its spiritual vigour, when it revelled in the gifts of some of the greatest preachers that Wales, or indeed any other country, has produced since Apostolic times, and when to be a Churchman was to bear a stigma and a reproach in many parishes throughout Wales.

Is it any wonder that an intensely religious, emotional, and enthusiastic people should have become alienated under such circumstances? But even then God did not leave Himself without witness in the old Mother Church of Wales. It would not be difficult to name a considerable number of clergy in North and South Wales who, between 1820 and 1860, were men of eminent saintliness and rare devotedness, who still fed the sacred fire on the old altar, or, in other words, were the salt that kept the mass from putrefaction. But what is remarkable is this, that during that lowest ebb of the Church's spiritual life, no attack was made on her position or possessions. It was only with the returning flow of vitality and activity that organized opposition showed itself. But what I have described constituted only a part of the Church's difficulties. While in that condition the population in some parts of Wales was increasing at a greater ratio than in any other part of the kingdom, with the exception of London and the county of Durham. There was also the poverty of her endowments, the enormous size of many of her parishes, the non-residence of not a few of her incumbents, the existence of two living languages side by side among the same people, with other harassing and embarrassing circumstances, which time will not allow me now to enter into. But it was at that time, when the old Church of Wales was apparently in almost a hopeless

condition, that the returning tide of life and power began to throb within her. One of the first signs of Church revival in South Wales was the establishment of the Llandaff Church Extension Society in 1851, a Society which has since spent £69,922 in home mission operations in that diocese, calling forth at least as much again from local and other sources. Not only so, but in 1883 the present Bishop of Llandaff started what is known as the "Bishop of Llandaff's Fund," which in twelve years has spent £10,794 16s. 10d. in the support of additional clergy, calling forth £33,000 from other sources; and a further sum of £16,856 1s. in the erection of churches and mission rooms, calling forth £123,988, with £13,589 5s. 1d. still in hand; in all £41,312 6s. 1d. Time will not enable me to bring before you the Church Extension operations of the three other Welsh dioceses, and what I have said of the Diocese of Llandaff is imperfect and incomplete. But I am tempted to give you two examples of parochial work and progress—one an English parish, that of Roath, in the suburbs of Cardiff; the other a bilingual parish, that of Ystrad, in the mining district of the Rhondda; the former worked on what is conventionally known as "High Church" lines, the latter on "Evangelical" lines, and both inclusive of the work of all the existing incumbents. Take first the parish of Roath:—

ROATH.

In 1881. 1 Parish—Roath.	In 1895. 3 Parishes—Roath, S. German's, S. Saviour's.
1881. 6 Clergy.	1895. 13 Clergy.
1881. 1 Permanent Church.	1895. 6 Permanent Churches.
1 Iron Church.	1 Iron Church.
2 Schoolrooms for Services.	3 Mission Rooms.
1881. 301 Baptisms.	1891. 755 Baptisms.
1881. 115 Confirmed.	1891. 167 Confirmed.
	1895. 200 and over Confirmed.
1881. 498 Easter-Day Communicants.	1891. 1,431 Easter-Day Communicants.
	1895. 1,700 Easter-Day Communicants.

In the three parishes there are 5,200 Sunday school teachers and scholars, and there is a daily celebration in each parish.

PARISH OF YSTRADYFODWG.

1869.	1895.
1 Incumbent, 3 Curates—4 Clergy.	5 Incumbents, 16 Assistant Clergy—21 Clergy.
1 Parish.	5 Parishes.
2 Churches.	13 Permanent Churches.
1 Cottage Mission.	1 Iron Church.
	1 School Church.
	3 Mission Rooms.
	2 Hired School Board Rooms for Service.
	2 Rooms under Church. All free and *unappropriated.*
	2 Churches have Baptistries for immersion.
2 Sunday Schools.	20 Sunday Schools.
	Bible Classes.
	Bands of Hope.
	Prayer and Temperance Meetings.
	Church Lads' Brigade.
	G.F.S.
	2 more Churches approaching completion.
	A third Church—Foundation Stone laid.

Extension since 1892.—Appeal for £8,000.

Work done.—Mother Church enlarged; Treorky Church, 400 sittings; Ynysfeino Church, 350 sittings.—1 enlargement, 3 building and built.

Work doing.—Ystrad Rhondda Church, 450.

Work wanted.—Gelli Road; Pant Rhondda.

N.B.—Full and regular services throughout.

The parish itself is increasing 2,500 per annum; 69,000 at last census; half still in the mother parish.

I hope I need hardly say that I do not wish it to be inferred that such instances of Church work and progress are general throughout Wales, though some other equally remarkable examples of activity and zeal might be adduced, such as those of Llanelly and Swansea, in the diocese of S. David's; but I have brought forward these two cases as instances of progress under widely different circumstances, and in the face of many and peculiar difficulties. And here let me remind you, that, in forty-one years, the sum of £117,949 was expended in the restoration of the four Welsh Cathedrals; and that between the years 1840 and 1891, £2,216,723 was spent in the restoration of churches in Wales, exclusive of sums under £500. In the ten years ending in 1892, 103 churches were built in Wales and 185 restored. In the one year, 1892, £90,042 were voluntarily given for this purpose. In the year 1893, 11,540 were confirmed; and the number of Sunday school attendants rose from 92,000 in 1885 to 130,000 in 1893. In three successive periods of three years, candidates for Confirmation in the Diocese of Llandaff increased from 7,200 to 10,300; and from 10,300 to 12,400. From 1848 to 1894, the Additional Curates' Society made grants to Wales of £124,461, and the Church Pastoral Aid Society in like manner, from 1840 to 1895, £217,069; nor should it be forgotten that each grant not only represented some additional Church agency, but in many, if not in most, instances, a proportionate amount was called forth from local and other sources. But, deeply gratifying as is this evidence of quickened zeal and activity among Welsh Churchmen, it should not be forgotten that the Church in Wales numbers among her adherents a large portion of the wealthier members of the community, and that she has also the further advantage of her endowments, inadequate as they are for her ever-increasing needs. Moreover, what I have said refers only to what has been done, but takes no account of what has been left undone. Ground for devout thankfulness and encouragement we have; but not for boastfulness or self-complacency: for if Church history teaches us anything at all, it warns us that, side by side with much outward activity, there may exist a lack of that higher motive power and spiritual energy, without which Church work is only so much machinery. No amount of organization will produce life, but life will produce organization. Not that the Church in Wales is over-organized. On the contrary, there are things which she urgently needs, and must have, if she is to carry out her great mission with efficiency and success. For one thing, she wants a great Evangelistic agency, a band of holy men, trained and tested, entirely detached from all other aims and duties, and possessed by the one passion of awakening, quickening, and converting human souls. Such men Wales had in the earlier years of the present century, and may have again by waiting upon God.

Think of Williams of Pantycelyn, the prince of Welsh Hymnologists, travelling on foot or on horseback on an average three thousand miles a year for more than fifty years. Is it possible to speak too warmly of the amazing self-denial of such men, men who lit their torches at the altar of the old Mother Church? We also want a revival of the ancient ordinance of catechizing in the primitive sense, to include, if possible—and why not possible?—all ages and all classes. It is hardly credible the ignorance of Holy Scripture, and of the great distinctive truths of Christianity, which not seldom exists amongst those who have been familiar with the services of the Church from their childhood; and this is true of what are called the upper as much as of the lower classes. At a time when the tide of secularism, materialism, worldliness, and scepticism is coming in like a flood upon us, nothing but intelligent, definite, well-grounded convictions can withstand and overcome it; and for this there is no instrument like the ancient order of catechizing. Is it too much to say that the Welsh revival of the last century would, humanly speaking, hardly have been possible if it had not been for the catechizing labours of that most illustrious Welsh Churchman of the eighteenth century, Griffith Jones of Llanddowror, whose great work on the Church Catechism will bear comparison with any work of the kind in any age of the world, and who was the means, under God, of teaching 150,000 of his fellow-countrymen to read the Word of God? Another urgent want of the Church in Wales, in my humble judgment, is that of the special training of candidates for Holy Orders. We want a better system of selecting and training our candidates, and some means of testing and developing their spiritual life and experience, as well as their aptitude for the work of the ministry, before they are set apart for that work. Our existing institutions are doing an excellent work; but they cannot do all that is needed during the short time in which the candidates are under their care. There are few Welsh incumbents more indebted to S. David's College than I am, if only for the devoted yokefellows I had from there during my two incumbencies of Cardiff and Wrexham. At the same time I should not be sorry to see the appliances of that most useful institution devoted mainly, if not exclusively, to the special and practical training of our future Welsh clergy, leaving their general education to the three University Colleges, now subsidized by the State to the extent of £12,000 a year. And from this there naturally follows another need, that of a far higher standard of pulpit efficiency. In Wales, preaching holds a very different place in public estimation to what it seems to hold in England. What, for instance, would English folk think of a parish of people leaving their cornfields in the height of harvest to attend a service at the parish church at twelve o'clock in the day? This have I seen again and again. Far greater stress than formerly is now laid on the pastoral functions of the ministry, and very rightly so; but effective preaching is still the key to a Welshman's heart. And here let me say, that I should be glad to see a revival of the old clerical meetings, which for more than a century were a great institution in the Church in Wales, and were often greatly blessed to both clergy and people. By clerical meetings is not meant meetings of clergy only, as the term is understood in England, but meetings of clergy and laity, sometimes for mutual conference, but more frequently for a succession of sermons, beginning in the evening of one day, and continued morning,

afternoon, and evening of the next day, with two sermons at each service. And on those occasions, let me tell you, sermons meant sermons. They were none of your English sermonettes, but honest discourses of the good old-fashioned type, with the orthodox introduction, divisions, and a rousing application at the close. If I may judge by what I have heard and read of late years, I rather fancy that English congregations have no great love for sermons with very practical applications to them, whereas my countrymen rather enjoy a somewhat energetic pulpit flagellation. But whatever may be the case in England, it is certain that the people of Wales will never put up with the "food for infants" which some pious dyspeptics on this side of Offa's Dyke find suitable to their enfeebled digestion. No, no, my brethren; my countrymen love to have "strong meat" from the pulpit; and if the Church in Wales is as wise as she should be, she will leave nothing undone to raise the standard of efficiency among her clergy, and to make her pulpit both a spiritual and an intellectual power throughout my native land.

A closing word as to the future of the Church in Wales. That future, under God, rests largely with the Church herself. What Wales needs is not religious discussions, but a living Christianity; not criticism, but a dogmatic faith; not seeking after truth, but a bold, faithful, and unfaltering presentation of Him who is "the Truth." The contests of the future in Wales must not be "who shall be the greatest," but who shall dive deepest into the depths of human misery and sin, and who shall make the greatest sacrifices to win for Christ the 500,000 souls who are now "as sheep having no shepherd." The lowliest are ever the strongest; and the Church of the future in Wales will be the Church which shall conquer by love, and which shall drink deepest into the Spirit of Him who said, "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

---

(3) Proposed Disestablishment and Disendowment.

The Rev. J. Owen, Principal of S. David's College, Lampeter; Canon of S. Asaph.

Recent events have happily changed the position of the proposed Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Welsh Dioceses since I accepted an invitation to read a paper on the subject before this Congress. Under this change of circumstances, I may, I hope, be permitted to take a broad practical view of the present position of my subject, so as to make it almost equivalent to "The future Policy of Church Defence" from a Welsh Churchman's point of view. In the light of recent experience, so long as the whole Church will persist in intelligently arraying herself in full force in support of the Welsh dioceses, I cannot see, for my part, what tactical advantage the promoters of the Disestablishment of the whole Church can gain by again renewing the strategy of a flank attack to compensate for the enervation of principle inevitably involved in making Offa's Dyke a boundary in morality. The loyalty of English Churchmen to the fundamental principle of the integrity of the Church needed not the encouragement of the gain of six Welsh seats and the substantial

reduction of hostile majorities almost all along the Welsh line, to scorn the sordid temptation of purchasing temporary truce for thirty dioceses of our common Church at the cost of four, and the sacrifice of principle. The Welsh dioceses have special reason for thankfulness for the defeat of a measure which, had it been carried, would have crippled the Church in Wales for at least one generation. It has been, you may imagine, a severe strain for years to bear the brunt of the attack upon the Church, and I cannot tell you how heartily we Welsh Churchmen welcome the prospect of a period of less prominence and more peace.

The Church Congress has now to consider the responsibility of victory. The value of victory is measured by the use made of it. If we either lose our heads or shut our eyes and fold our hands over temporary triumph, we may live to regret the largeness of our majority. Now is the time for making the Church impregnable against all future attacks in our day, by a judicious policy of education and reform. To stand still is to go back. We must go on as we wish the Church to have permanent peace for her spiritual mission, and go on in the direction which recent experience has shown to be required. Education and reform, happily, are not only means of Church Defence, but also at the same time much more means of Church progress. The discharge of the immediate responsibility of victory will not at all therefore retard the Church in her supreme duty of always following after her highest aim.

Take the work of education. Our business has lately been, of necessity, the correction of all sorts of errors current in the country about the Church. We could not freely choose our topics, nor fix their order, under the disadvantage of defence. Now the distress is past, and we can take our own line, and build up on foundations broad and deep a positive system of constructive teaching. The truth about the Church —her past history, present work, and future aims—has to be brought home to the people throughout the land. If this is steadily done for six years, the next crop of Liberationist fallacies will not be as luxuriant as the last. The more the truth about the Church all around is known, the more she will win the enthusiasm of her own children, and the respect and goodwill of Nonconformists. Our age is the era of wholesale education. The time has come in the spiritual interests of the Church, had there been no duty of Church Defence, for a new departure on a larger scale in the education of the nation about the Church. The recent attack has been of real use in arousing interest on the question, even in quarters of normal indifference. There is now a favourable opportunity which may not soon recur. After years of painful controversy, we are not likely to forget the need of watchfulness as to tone. Tone is the soul of teaching. Ill-temper weakens any teacher. Teaching, like every other duty, has its trials. But the trials of duty are not to be put in the scale against the sure penalty that follows shirking duty. If the Church were now to neglect her duty of doing her best to give the nation the instruction necessary for understanding the grave religious issues at stake in Disestablishment and Disendowment, she would become, by her neglect, an accessory before the fact to any national disaster that might follow in the future from popular ignorance. The right way to the goal of Christian charity amidst all classes of the community is, not for the Church to neglect any of her duties towards

the nation, but rather to be faithful all round to her trust, in prayerful faith that Divine grace is sufficient to sustain human infirmity under the heaviest burden of complex duty.

There is no time to touch upon heads of necessary instruction beyond one observation. Since there has been an attempt to take away the character of the Welsh dioceses in order to take away their endowments, facts about the Church in Wales necessary for showing that this attempt was as unjust as it was ungenerous ought to be everywhere included in our scheme of instruction. When the religious geography and religious history of Wales become well-known in England, no future Government will be in a hurry to adopt a policy of piecemeal Disestablishment. Since I am to be followed by the noble lord to whom the successful start of the Archbishops' Parochial Committees is so largely due, I must not trench upon his indispensable subject of organization. But I ask permission, as a Welsh Churchman, to discharge a debt of honour by pointing out the advantage to the new organization of the loyal adhesion of the Church Defence Institution, which has victoriously borne the burden and heat of the day. We owe a warm debt of gratitude to its able staff for their untiring devotion to the cause.

Our Welsh leader of Church Defence, the Bishop of S. Asaph, has lost no time in pressing for careful consideration of Church Reform. The subject has been warmly received by both clergy and laity at the two diocesan conferences held last month in North Wales. No separate legislation of any sort for the Welsh dioceses is contemplated by Welsh Churchmen. Our consistent position is that the Welsh dioceses are an integral part—the most ancient part, remember—of our one common Church. For our distinctively local problems, our diocesan powers of local government are ample. The root of the matter for us, a true, brave spirit of love, is not to be obtained from Parliament. In the days of the Tudors and the Stuarts, the Welsh people were "the stoutest Churchmen in the country," to quote Mr. Gladstone. The reversal of Walpole's sinister policy a quarter of a century ago has put the Welsh dioceses, with both firmness and sympathy of administration, again well on the way of winning for themselves the warm heart of the Celt. There is a fountain of sympathy as well as of strength in union. Our counsels are broadened, our sympathies steadied and enlarged, our energies quickened, as well as our patience fortified by the healthy consciousness that we have our indissoluble share, on an equal footing, in a great inheritance. Our present fully recognized position in our common Church is to us Welsh Churchmen an invaluable means of education. No Welshman of common sense becomes a less sterling Welshman by education, or else the present development of Welsh national education from top to bottom, unparalleled for rapidity in Europe, would very soon be the ruin of Welsh nationality. Our watchword in Wales must be, "Truth in love." The real patriot is the man who loves his country, whether she smiles on him, or whether she for a season frowns, not a person who is always worrying his country to love him enough. Love is loyal and true, neither accepting errors nor ignoring faults. The movement of love is from heart to heart, rather than from head to head. If we, Welsh Churchmen, like our forefathers of the Tudor days, the translators of the Welsh Bible, go on patiently and truly loving and working for our country, the hearts of the Welsh people will once again

cleave more and more to the old mother Church of Wales. On such conditions it is only a question of time, by the power of Him who, in mysterious ways, ever doeth all things well, each thing in its due season. So long as we see within our horizon a vista of an approaching reign of Christian charity in Wales, we can bear to wait with patience for the ripening of the good fruit of visible corporate reunion.

The close connection of Church Reform with Church Defence occasions now, in natural sequence, our keen interest in Wales in reform. We were not defending abuses. My subject only requires me to glance at this single general aspect of Church Reform. There is a higher aspect which must be studied to understand the other. From my point of view, in the present paper, emphasis falls on urgency of well-considered action rather than on details. Education about the Church will not be adequate for future Church Defence without a guarantee of a gradual process of all reforms that may be really necessary. The times call for courage as well as for caution. Were it possible to conceive of the next six years sliding by without a solid instalment of reform being carried, we would then have to face the sorrowful conviction, in the minds of many devoted Churchmen in Wales and England who are against Disestablishment, that there would be nothing left, for the sake of fair play, at any cost, to the spiritual progress of the Church, but Disestablishment. Spiritual progress, we all agree, is the supreme interest of the Church. Disestablishment would not be reform, but revolution. Revolutions are not popular in this country, because of the settled confidence of the people that all changes really desirable may be obtained by a gradual process of reform. The analogy between civil and Church reforms becomes false if pressed far, but within its right limits it has its lesson. All know that the Church has hitherto been hindered in regard to reform by circumstances beyond her control. All that is changed now, and on us lies to-day the full responsibility of the dimensions of our victory. The main point is for Churchmen to go on shoulder to shoulder. Union proved to be our strength against Disestablishment. There again will lie our strength for reform. Without union, nothing can or ought to be done. With union we can obtain all that reason requires.

There exists already general consent as to the urgency of some definite objects of reform. Let us first of all definitely secure this first urgent instalment upon which we are practically agreed. When that is secured, it would be wise, I submit, afterwards, instead of frittering strength upon more debateable details, to concentrate energy upon gaining more adequate synodical representation of the voice of the Church, and more reasonable Parliamentary procedure in Church matters, so as to give legislative effect to the voice of the Church, adequately ascertained, in regard to the control of her own internal concerns. It is neither desirable nor possible for all details of reform which may be in themselves desirable, to be carried all of a heap within a short period; but it is both most desirable and possible for the Church to obtain now, with a view to the future, greater power of regulating a gradual process of reform, so that she need not henceforth suffer injury from anybody who may care to make political capital by Parliamentary obstruction of Church business. All Churchmen will agree that this is a scandal that ought most certainly to be stopped once and for all. We can count, I am certain,

upon the generous sympathy of a large body of Nonconformists with our movement of Church reform. Supreme concern for spiritual progress is by no manner of means the monopoly of Churchmen. Nonconformists, on the other hand, can count on our support should they desire the same modification of Parliamentary procedure to facilitate the revision of their trust deeds, to express better their views of their own denominational arrangements. The more we can do, the better, to show that we have been contending against Disestablishment only for the sake of national recognition of Christianity—for righteousness, not for privilege.

Let there be no room for mistake as to motive. Reform is part of an intelligent future policy of Church defence, but this is only an occasion, not the cause of the movement of reform. Were reform merely caused by a policy of defence, it would not be worth very much. Concern for clearing the ground for the spiritual progress of the Church is the ruling motive of reform, and this motive must determine every detail. Circumstances have forced upon us a subordinate duty of defence; but we never professed to like it. The Church was not founded for mere defence, but for mission. It is a growing sense of the majesty of the Church's mission that puts sternness in the present resolution to have reform. To understand the movement, we must look back across more than a century. Of all the remarkable features of this period of British history, future historians will have reason to pronounce the marvellous revival, the many-sided progress of the Church, not the least remarkable in permanent result upon national welfare. It is a splendid paradox to see the Church to-day, warm with the glow of wholesome life, in the full tide of all this progress, on the morrow of an extraordinary victory, true to her mission, bent upon reform. It is because we in Wales have for many years shared in Church revival, and long to share it more and more, that we are keen in sharing in the movement of reform. This movement of the Church in Wales, as well as in England, is a movement, not of fear, but of hope; not of restlessness, but of growth; not of weakness, but of strength, resolved to shake herself free of needless encumbrances, of anachronisms and abuses, for still greater service in the century that is coming, for her country and her Lord.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. C. J. THOMPSON, Vicar of S. John's, Cardiff; and Hon. Canon of Llandaff.

MY subject is "The Church in Wales: its work in the present day."

I.—I interpret this to mean—What in your opinion is its nature and its value? By way of answer to this question I would reply—the work of the Church in Wales is distinguished by (1) Exceptional and special difficulties; (2) Sustained activity; (3) Rapidity of expansion; (4) Hopefulness.

1.—*Difficulties of a special and exceptional character.*

(i.) First, there is the bilingual difficulty, felt mainly in the mountain and pastoral regions of North and Central Wales, and the colliery districts of the South. Everywhere, indeed, there is a growing acquaintance with the English tongue, for the

schoolmaster has been abroad for at least two generations; but nevertheless, throughout the rural and colliery districts the worship of the chapel, the columns of the press, the discussions of the people, are mostly carried on in the ancient language of the race. It is clear, therefore, that in Welsh Wales the Church must be a Welsh-speaking, Welsh-sympathizing Church. And herein lies at once her opportunity and the difficulty of her task—a difficulty magnified by this consideration, that, being the Church of the place, and of all the dwellers within it, the obligation is laid upon her to supply efficient ministrations in two widely different tongues. The effort to meet this condition of things must necessarily be arduous, for it needs no argument to prove that the adequate mastery of two languages is a much rarer accomplishment than the mastery of one. That the difficulty is dauntlessly faced and grappled with, that it is successfully encountered, is one of the most inspiriting signs of the vigorous vitality both of the old language, and the old Church. Yet it is easy to exaggerate in this matter. In all the larger towns and industrial centres, and very generally throughout the Principality, the language of the "predominant partner" is current coin, while Cardiff—the metropolis—is practically as English as Chester, or Liverpool.

(ii.) A second difficulty special to Wales is the poverty of her endowments, both educational and ecclesiastical. Until quite recently, the wide and generous culture which has been almost the patrimony of the English clergy was denied to their less favoured Welsh brethren—who were thus heavily handicapped in the race of life. A brighter day has at length dawned. S. David's College, Lampeter, the three University Colleges, the easier accessibility of Oxford and Cambridge, tend to equalize educational conditions, and afford means of securing a properly qualified class of men to serve in the ministry of the Church. Not so hopeful is the outlook in the sphere of ecclesiastical endowments. Nowhere immoderate, mostly small, often wholly inadequate, the life of the Welsh incumbent is in, perhaps, a majority of instances, one of prolonged struggle with anxiety, privation, and care. This is especially true in the case of the clergy who in the larger towns, and through the mineral districts, find themselves, with the scantiest endowment, called upon to provide for the spiritual wants of ever-multiplying masses of needy humanity. Cardiff, whose population has doubled itself within the last two decades, and the Rhondda Valley, are cardinal instances in point. But such difficulties, formidable though they be, only act as a stimulus and spur, and have endued the Church with its second distinguishin mark—*Activity*.

(2) *Activity*—various—intelligent—sustained—is a note of the Church in Wales today. Everywhere, both clergy and laity are at work, the former very often with an energy which should bring the latter to their side. Take the case of Church services alone. In Cardiff there are *seventeen* churches with weekly and week-day celebrations, where, twenty-five years ago, there was but one—*four* with daily celebrations, and *thirteen* with daily mattins or evensong, or both. This at least shows that the churches are used, that the clergy are often in them, and that they believe in their vocation as servants of the sanctuary. And what is true of Cardiff is true of perhaps every considerable town in the Principality. In other spheres of energy, too, the Church of Wales is in no way behind her English sister, and in one she fairly contests the claim for superiority—I refer to the department of Church finance. Hardest of all tasks, and most unthankful, the clergy in Wales, to their honour be it said, have thrown themselves into the breach, and many an unpromising parish can show the abiding results of their courageous and persistent importunity for the sake of Christ and of His poor. Again, thrice within fifteen years, we have entertained this Congress, and Swansea, Cardiff, and Rhyl may be cited as witnesses to the zeal and activity of our Church life.

Activity! there is almost too much of it. We want, rather, an ordinance of rest. We want protection against the unquiet spirits who are always scheming new societies, creating fictitious wants, and making the lives of the parochial clergy, overburdened as they are, wearisome and sad. We are over-organized, we are tormented by men and women primed with fallacies and fads, and some of us sigh for a return to the days when deputations from parent societies were few, and ere "general," "executive," and "sub-committees" brooded like a nightmare over every sore taxed parish priest. It cannot be said that the Church in Wales is deficient in activity, and therefore we look in confidence for evidences of her progress. These are manifest in, thirdly, the *Rapidity of her expansion.*

(3) The expansion and growth of the Church in the Principality during the last three decades is one of the largest facts of modern ecclesiastical history. Whether one takes the greater towns—Aberdare, Cardiff, Swansea, to speak of the district with which I am most familiar—or the densely populated hill sides and valleys of our coal fields, the multiplication of churches, mission chapels, schools, means of grace, communicants, adherents, has, within recent years, proceeded at a rate beyond all former precedent. Evidence of this is furnished by every Episcopal charge, and the substantial progress indicated by these facts is not contested even by our foes. The difference between them and us is wholly one of inference. In their view, the Church revival is solely due to a desire to stave off Disendowment; in ours, it betokens the Divine blessing upon a higher conception of duty, and re-kindled faith in the Word and Sacraments, and in the Divine ministry with which we have been clothed. If I speak more especially of my own town, it is with no desire to belittle or ignore what has been done, and is doing, elsewhere, but only because I am thus within the limits of accurate information, and can vouch personally for the facts set forth. Swansea, Aberdare, Pontypridd, and the Rhondda Valley can probably show a record no whit inferior to that of Cardiff. But note the growth of the Church in Cardiff during the last twenty-five years. In 1870 there were *six* consecrated churches; to-day there are *sixteen*, and in addition, *twelve* mission chapels, or temporary churches, a total of *twenty-eight*, showing nearly a fivefold rate of increase, while the Parish Church has been rebuilt and restored at a cost of £16,000. But this fact will perhaps be regarded as more remarkable if I say that inclusive of the ten additional consecrated churches, and the Parish Church, twenty of these buildings have been erected within the last sixteen years. In the matter of clergy, the increase is no less remarkable. In 1870 there were certainly not more than a dozen; to-day there are between forty and fifty. During this period the population has more than doubled, but, though far from adequate to this overwhelming increase, the Church's rate of progress is much the greater of the two. It is said that communicants should number ten per cent. of the population. We cannot, indeed, stand that test . . . are there any similar towns that can?—but there are, at least, two populous parishes of Cardiff which approximate even to that high standard. Meantime, *five thousand* communicants last Easter Day says something for Church feeling, and is perhaps not an unsatisfactory evidence of an expanding and deepening spiritual life. Further, it may not perhaps be thought impertinent to this subject, if I say that the total endowments on which this organization, inclusive of day schools accommodating *six thousand* children, is built, does not exceed £1,700 per annum. Lastly, we claim *Hopefulness* as a note of the Church in Wales to-day.

(4) We Welsh Churchmen are hopeful of the future, as rich in promise for the historic order and the ancient creed. Wealthy, powerful we shall never be, save through the winning of the people's confidence and love. Are there signs that we are achieving this, and justifying our claim to continue the National Church of the

land? I believe there are, and foremost among them is the increasing attachment to the Church of the working and lower middle classes of our people. Hitherto the former have been indifferent, and the latter have been the bulwark of Dissent. It is largely the case still, but a movement Churchward is distinctly visible; and wherever Church teaching and individual earnestness go hand in hand, there is a ready sympathy and response on the part of the people. If only we clergy are true to our mission and our vows, the Church which we serve may yet win the coming democracy for Christ. The old suspicion and dislike have been almost wholly overcome. The clergy are not, as a rule, envied for their supposed wealth, and alleged social position. They are not separated from the interests of their neighbours and parishioners, and do not hold themselves aloof, and apart. In my town, they are neither diners out, nor lovers of afternoon tea, nor devotees of tennis or golf; but a class of men sparing in recreation for themselves, though dispensing it liberally to others, because they find a higher pleasure in dealing with the solemn interests and issues of life. We are hopeful of the future amidst many and great discouragements, because at length we think we are able to discern signs that our work is telling for good. One such sign I see in the signal victories won by the Church party at the polls. Am I mistaken in this conjecture? However it may have been elsewhere, I believe that Cardiff and Swansea cast off the Radical yoke mainly as a protest against undesired, and unjust legislative assault upon Church and school. And, if this supposition be correct, I am equally convinced that the safety of the Church is due, not to conventional methods of Church Defence—though these have their value—but chiefly to the solid, sustained, patient, and ever-extending work which the Church has been *doing* for a quarter of a century past.

Such is but an imperfect sketch of the work that the Church in Wales is doing to-day. But my testimony would be incomplete were I to conclude without a second interpretation of my subject.

II.—Her "work in the present day." What *ought* it to be? What *must* it be if we are to fill the land, and "occupy till the Master come?" This is the second question I would seek to answer.

(1) We must have unity among ourselves—unity of aim, unity of action, and, as nearly as may be, unity of method. We shall never win those that are without, so long as there are irreconcilable differences and antagonisms within.

(2) We want a larger-hearted sympathy with the toilers and the poor—a belief fervent and zealous, that their condition is one which *can* be and *ought* to be permanently bettered by the wealthy, the fortunate, and the strong. We want to feel an honest shame that men should ever have acquiesced in the monstrous inequalities of human conditions, and been content to leave them as they are. We want to be persuaded that social selfishness is soul-destroying sin, and "love of the brethren" the only effectual union with Christ.

(3) We, in Wales, while cherishing every national sentiment that is worthy, and jealous of all that seeks to obliterate one distinguishing feature which links us in living oneness with our past, want to step over the hampering confines of our insularity, and inhale freely the invigorating atmosphere of the larger life beyond our borders. The Church in Wales is not Welsh alone, nor English alone, but Welsh and English in one. There is room—there is need for English work and English workers within it, not to supplant, but to strengthen the hands of their Welsh brothers, and ill and mischievous will be the result of any misrepresentation of this fact. However it may have been in a past, of which, perhaps, we have heard enough, the Church in Wales—I say it without a blush—owes no debt but one of loving recognition to the

English workers who have laboured within her borders for certainly a generation past.

(4) We want an answer—generous, sympathetic, liberal—to the exceeding bitter cry of a Church yearning to seek and to save, but paralyzed in her efforts by lack of men and means. With but a few conspicuous exceptions, its appeal is made to ears so deaf, and to hearts so slow to feel, that often it is hard to possess one's soul in patience, and to exercise the "charity" which "never faileth." Everywhere there is money; hardly anywhere, the open hand of the liberal that maketh rich. The wealth of Glamorganshire, the fortunes amassed in Cardiff and throughout the whole area of the coal district, probably exceed the record of any other community, or time. But, as yet, its owners, as a class, have not learnt "to do good and to distribute," and there is little sign of the sacrifices with which God is well pleased. Little sign, that is, commensurate with the magnificent opportunities and the urgent calls; but we are thankful there is some, for the honoured names of Talbot, Tredegar, and Dillwyn Llewelyn, among others, are to the hearts of the Churchmen of South Wales what the colours of its regiment are to its disheartened, broken warriors, when once more they rally for the fight.

(5) Above all, we want to remember constantly that we witness to a Divine idea, and minister as servants of a living Christ, and that we do this in a day of blasphemy and rebuke. The forces mustering against us are not those which would destroy *one* Church, but *all;* scornful of our dearest hopes, because rejectors of Christ, and deniers of God.

When Lord Selborne came to Wales, on a memorable occasion, some ten years ago, his charge to the students of Lampeter was, "Be spiritual, be spiritual, be spiritual," and the words and the idea for a moment seemed somewhat irrelevant amid the clangour and stirrings of Church Defence. But he sounded the true note. The work we have done hitherto, are doing now, and hope to do, what will it be when tested in the balance of the sanctuary, if it be not spiritual? "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but such as are mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds."

(6) Lastly, if we are to vindicate our position in the land, we must be a *teaching*, as well as a preaching Church. We have been too much afraid of distinctive teaching, we have been impatient of the task.

Let the Church boldly assert her claims to the obedience of all the baptized. Let her minister in the school and in the home, as well as in the church, and at least she will have the satisfaction of an approving conscience, and it may be, even in our generation, of bringing into oneness thousands of the separated children of God.

PAPER.

(4) Parochial Organization of Church Defence.

The Right Hon. the Earl of Selborne.

There are two points that I would like respectfully to ask your attention to. The first is the great responsibility which rests upon all Churchmen and Churchwomen to see that in the future all Church children and Church people are educated in the history of their own Church. We have always paid attention to the education of our children in regard to the history of our country; why have we so culpably neglected their education in regard to the history of their Church? Yet it is so. Who

of you are taught Church history at a Public school? Who of you are taught it in a Middle Class school? Where is it taught at all? Is it taught in our National schools? Is it taught in our Sunday schools? No, and what is the result? The English Churchman or Churchwoman who leaves his or her country, he or she cannot tell why he or she is a Churchman or Churchwoman. They are met with untrue assertions as to the origin of the property of their Church, and they cannot contradict them because they have no knowledge of the facts. Assertions are made that the property was created only at the Reformation, and they cannot refute the statements, but maintain the silence of ignorance. Now, the responsibility rests upon us that this shall no longer be the case. No Churchman can possibly doubt, whatever his views on disestablishment and disendowment may be, that it is incumbent upon us to see that our children are taught the true history of the Church of England, the origin of her property, and the uses she makes of it. I am told that the day of battle is past, that we can now rest on our laurels. Those who give that advice are most shortsighted; now is the moment to begin our real work in earnest. During the last year or so we have been fighting with our back to the wall, but now we can go about our work systematically, and begin it from the very beginning, and see that it is continuous and well thought out. The responsibility rests upon us, and especially upon those who agree with me (the great majority of Churchpeople), that disestablishment and disendowment would be calamitous; we all of us believe that our only and real danger comes from ignorance. Therefore, upon us lies the responsibility to see that that ignorance shall no longer exist. I cannot leave this point without paying my respectful and grateful tribute of gratitude to that institution, the Church Defence Institution, which, when all of us were not thinking so much about this question of education as we ought to have been thinking of it, was the pioneer in the work, and thereby laid the foundations upon which the victory we have recently reaped were based.

The second point that I would press upon your attention is that the Church of England has suffered, and is suffering, from what I may call the absence of an organized Church opinion. It has suffered from that want in its external relations; it suffers from that want in its internal economy. In its external relations the Church is brought into contact with the State. It would be brought into contact with the State even if it were disestablished and disendowed; but it is specially brought into contact as things are at present. The Church contains the majority, the great majority, the very great majority of the population, yet the Church has received less attention from Parliament than any other religious body in the country. And why? Because the Church has never had any organized Church opinion. I will not allude now to controversial questions, even such as that of the Voluntary schools, which may naturally arouse opposition from those who differ from us; but I will take a question merely affecting the Church itself.

We will say such a question as the increase of the Episcopate. A Bill having that object would in days gone by have met with overt obstruction and opposition, and every effort would have been made by certain people to defeat that Bill, affecting only the Church which contains so vast a proportion of our population. But a Bill introduced in the

interests of any Dissenting body, affecting some small object, such as has often been before Parliament relating to the smallest Nonconformist sect, would never have met with opposition at all. Why? Because Members of Parliament would have known that the whole weight of that sect was behind that Bill, and that it was not worth their while by opposing it to put against them every member of that sect in their constituencies. But Members of Parliament never regarded the Church in that light. They regarded the Bills or the proposals on behalf of the Church as the offspring of some individual energetic bishop or clergyman. The idea that the laity were behind it never occurred to them, and, therefore, they thought they could act in regard to such proposals according to their private notions.

Do not suppose that I am advocating that we should become a political Church. A Church cannot both be political and spiritual, and I am sure the clergy cannot be political and spiritual; but every Church has its business relations, and its business relations to my mind are specially the function of the laity, and it is the laity who ought to bring their opinion to bear, with results to the Church such as we are now beginning to realize. We are beginning to see it in the organization of the Voluntary schools—but that is only the beginning of it, and it ought to be impossible for Parliament to refuse a Church measure—a measure only affecting the Church, and on which the Churchpeople themselves are agreed. Both these questions are met by that great scheme which has been promulgated a year or so ago by the two archbishops. The archbishops take the units, the diocese and the parish, and it is on these units that the scheme is based. The Central Committee is the link binding all altogether at the head. Each diocese is to have its active working diocesan committee, superintending the local committees, who again will see to the work of imparting education in Church history.

I have heard it said that you cannot get committees in some parishes. That criticism arises merely from a misunderstanding of what is meant. The word committee in this connection does not mean a committee in the ordinary sense. The word may be well, or it may be badly chosen. But, granted the fact that it is chosen, what it means is a league or association, and what is most required is a good active secretary in each parish. I speak from experience, not only as a member of the Central Church Committee, but as one of the diocesan secretaries in my own diocese, when I say that there is not a single parish where such a committee is not possible.

I have been told that we have no educated people in this parish or in that parish to undertake the work of secretary. But you do not want education. In all my diocese the best secretary we have got is a platelayer. It is not the least necessary that the secretary, he or she, should be a gentleman or a gentlewoman in the usual acceptance of the term; and women, I may tell you, make as good secretaries as men. Our secretaries are of every class and of both sexes. Of course they work in harmony and in concert with the incumbent; but I would say this above all, that the last man who should be secretary is the incumbent. The incumbents are already overburdened with their present duties. This is a work for the laity; and when the clergy take this post, as many of them do, because they are afraid they could not find other suitable persons for the office, they are undertaking work which they are

not called upon to perform, and are unduly relieving from the laity. What is wanted when a secretary is found is gradually to let the work ramify through the parish, by systematic reading of literature, by conversation, by lectures, and by bringing legitimate influence to bear in every way possible upon those who require instruction. The work, and this is the key-note of the scheme, should be carried on through the natural relations of life. The secretary should be able to put his finger on this or that man, say a Nonconformist, who has always refused to listen to our side of the question, and, not going to him himself, find out who is intimate with the man, who is on good terms with him, and from whom he will readily accept information. Work slowly and systematically, and above all avoid this snare—the snare of thinking that this will not suit your parish. Believe me there does not exist an exceptional parish.

I have heard it said often, "This will do for every parish except mine. Our circumstances are quite different. You do not understand them." I do understand them, ladies and gentlemen. I was once a Whip, and when I became a member of the Central Church Committee, what I said to the secretary was that from my experience one of his greatest difficulties would be that with which I was often confronted as a Whip, viz., the assertion that the plan would not suit this or that place. But my experience and my opinion remain the same. Human nature is the same everywhere; and the same means applied with tact, with local knowledge, and with a real desire to achieve the end in view, will prevail everywhere. All that is required is genuine goodwill, genuine self-sacrifice, a genuine sense of responsibility, and a willingness to learn from those who have the experience.

In conclusion, I will only say to those who doubt, whether in this diocese or any other dioceses, that every information will be given you at the Church House by the Central Church Committee. If in your own diocese you do not have a committee fully charged with information and a secretary working like a steam engine on diocesan work, you will get all the help you need from the central office at the Church House. Let us go to work at once; because unless we use the next six years as our great opportunity, given to us in the midst of our trial, the responsibility upon us will be heavy indeed. If we use this opportunity, if during these six years we have carried education in regard to our Church's history through the length and breadth of England, and if the people grow up in the possession of that knowledge, the Church of England will be in a position of absolute impregnability against any forces that may be brought against her.

ADDRESS.

STANLEY LEIGHTON, Esq., M.P., Sweeney Hall, Oswestry.

[*Read by Canon De Chair.*]

LET us try to have a clear understanding of what we propose to do; and next, let us endeavour to use language which will not be misinterpreted. By "Church Defence" we do not mean the conversion of sinners, or the bringing into the fold of the Church those who are outside, or the maintenance of purity of doctrine—we touch

not spiritual or pastoral matters. What we do mean is simply the safeguarding of the material and outward organization of the Church.

There is no reason why those who are not members of the Church should not join us in this endeavour. As a matter of fact, many of them do help us. We labour as citizens for the good of the nation—a common object with all. But some Churchmen, and many opponents of the Church, put a stumbling-block in our way. They keep harping upon "State establishment," without ever having defined what they mean by the term. They speak as if "establishment" were an exclusive privilege of the Church of England, denied to all the denominations. Such a position, if true, would be difficult to defend; but it is both historically and legally untrue. The repetition of this "half-truth" is injurious to our cause.

"Dissenters are as much established as the Church." This is the legal fact, laid down in 1767 by Lord Mansfield in a judgment in the House of Lords. Practically before, but legally ever since the Act of Toleration, the Dissenters' way of worship has been established by law. *Legibus stabilita* is a term of indefinite signification, which merely expresses the friendly relations of the State towards all religious denominations, and the protection and privilege which it affords to them. I would refer anyone who is desirous of informing himself upon this subject to Mr. Nye's pamphlet, "The Establishment and Endowment of Dissent."

The attitude of mind which we desire to produce among the people, but especially among the electors, and which we have generally succeeded in producing, is well stated by Mr. C. J. Jackson, a candidate at the last election for East Glamorgan: "Although I am not a member of the Church, I object to property bequeathed to religious purposes being devoted to secular purposes; and I see no reason for treating the endowments of the Church with less respect than those of the Wesleyans, the Baptists, the Independents, or Calvinistic Methodists."

A perfectly similar statement may be made with regard to "establishment." All religious denominations have certain relations with the State. None of them are quite satisfied with these relations, and so they all appeal from time to time to Parliament to sanction re-arrangements. The Church is not wholly satisfied with her relations to the State. She requires from Parliament statutory re-arrangements. But it is impossible to get much from the House of Commons without having Parliamentary influence, and such influence comes from political organization.

Do not let us be ashamed of asserting the object of Church defence. By means of the labours of Church defenders, the country has lately warned politicians to keep their hands off the Church, and the policy of Church defence has become converted into a policy of constructive Church reform. But the necessity for organization remains the same. Organization is the easiest matter conceivable on paper, and the most perplexing in practice. As to areas, they must be large enough to insure the probability of finding workers in them. They must not be so large that the people who work together do not know each other. The extreme variety of the areas and populations of the parishes makes them unsuitable as a universal unit. Any practical man realizes at a glance the absurdity of organizing the city of London or the city of Norwich by parishes. The area of work should have some relation to the persons whom it is desired to influence. We organize for the election of a School Board, or a parish, or a district council, the area which returns the member. We desire, for Church Defence purposes, to influence the electorate. So the constituency seems to be the area for our operations, and the polling districts the units for our committees.

I am perfectly well aware that there is a nervous fear among some of the fathers of the Church and others, lest by thus claiming her right to influence legislation the Church should seem to be too political. What I want to see is the Church freed

from dependence upon the patronage or good will of either party. In a party sense I hope Churchmen will never be political; and I should be very sorry indeed to see her allied to the party to which I myself belong, for after a somewhat extended acquaintance with conservative Churchmanship, I do not admire it. The Church ought to be able to exercise an independent influence over the Government of the day; but how can she do so if Churchmen make it a point of honour to ignore their rights as citizens? "*Do ut Des*" is the motto of every Government, and if Churchmen have no support to give or to take away, they will be, not unnaturally, neglected and oppressed. Up to the present time it has been more advantageous for Governments and politicians to play for the Roman Catholic, or the Dissenting, or the Jewish vote, rather than for the vote of Churchmen. Latterly, however, through the organized action of Church defenders, the Church has asserted herself in an unmistakable way at the polls. The immediate result is that she finds herself surrounded with a great concourse of friends, especially in the House of Commons.

In deciding what we ought to oppose and what we ought to demand, the advice and leadership of the clergy is a most potent factor. If the clergy decline their share in this work, either from fear of being called political, or from dislike of the drudgery of organizing, committees for Church defence will not prosper. Laymen, I think, will do their work if the bishops and clergy do theirs. But partly from a deferential feeling towards the clergy, and partly from laziness, they will not move if the clergy hold back. I do not want the clergy to preach politics in the pulpit, or even to stand on political platforms; but I do say that they must be the backbone, if not the tongue and the hand, of Church defence.

I conclude. The highest appeals touch most the conscience of the people. A claim for an exclusive State establishment is neither high nor spiritual. But equal protection under the law as regards property is a principle which every Englishman believes in; and liberty to teach and preach religious doctrine in its fulness, without State interference, is the essence of that toleration which for two hundred years England has maintained. We ask no more from the State.

DISCUSSION.

HARRY PHILLIPS, Esq., Alderman of West Ham.

THROUGH the kindness of the Church Defence Institution, I was enabled to spend about a fortnight in North and South Wales during the past year, and I gained a great deal of experience there, and I want to corroborate what has already been said. I spent some little time at Cardiff, Swansea, the Rhondda Valley, and afterwards in places in the north, and what I noticed especially was the growth of Church life and the changing attitude of the workmen towards the Church. I was very much impressed with that. I had been expecting to find a bitter hostility all over the land from what I had read in the *Daily Chronicle* and the *Daily News*. Well, in chatting with men and sucking their brains, and trying to ascertain their views towards our Church, I found that the attitude of the workmen is rapidly changing. I imagine that this is because the attitude of the Church towards the workmen is also, and very rapidly, changing. I remember the case of a policeman who, when on his round, heard cries of "Murder" proceeding from a house. On entering he found an unusual sight, and perhaps it is a pity it is not more common. It was a woman who had got a man down on the ground, and was beating him with a poker. The policeman told the woman to let the man get up, and her reply was—"If you had had half the trouble I had to get him down, you would not say, 'Let him get up.'" I do not want to press the analogy, but I do want to say this—the Church during the last ten years has taken up the cry, "Let the man get up; let manhood get up.' The Church deplores the poor homes, the unfair sweating, all the evils that hamper

manhood, and is saying—Let the man or the woman, let what is good in the man or the woman, get up. The Church is taking a greater interest in the social condition of the people, and so the people are beginning to know that the Church is not only the Church of the rich and of a section, but that it really and truly goes out in sympathy to the working classes. Another point which I found out was, that the influence of the Nonconformist ministers—and I hope I am not offending anyone when I say it—in claiming the allegiance to themselves of their people's social and political opinions, as well as their religious opinions, is breaking down in Wales. The men are now thinking for themselves. The penny newspaper, the excursion train, the free library, have helped to bring the laity to look at life from a larger standpoint than hitherto, and they refuse to be dominated by the man in the pulpit in regard to their social and political, as well as their religious, opinions. They are realizing also a larger and broader aspect of a National Church. They are seeing that the Church is literally a national institution, bigger than the four walls of any church, and therefore bigger than the four walls of their chapel; and they are coming back to the fundamental position that we must have a national religion to meet the wants of all classes. Well, we must realize the responsibility that rests upon us in this matter. After our Lord raised Lazarus, He said, "Loose him, and let him go." All that stops a man from growth, get it from him, and "let him go." That is what the Lord is saying to-day. "All that hampers the influence and the growth of My Church, loose it, and let it go"—the sale of livings, the abuse of patronage, anything that impedes the growth of His Church. May I also add, the kind old clergymen who have lived in the past, who are no longer physically fitted for their task—find some scheme of pensions for them. "Loose them, and let them go," and find younger men possessed of the education, energy, and power necessary for the work. During the last year, and in the months of the election, a tremendous flood of enthusiasm for our Church swept over the land, and the halls were not large enough to hold the people. Well, the advice we hear in the kitchen, let me say again—Do not let the fire go out. The fire that was kindled then, keep alive in your hearts. Do not lean upon any political party; it will prove a broken reed, and will let you down if you lean upon it. But in proportion as we all lead the Christ-like life, so we shall put our Church upon a basis that no party can dethrone it from, and it will become the power in the land that we all wish it to be.

The Rev. J. M. WALKER, S. Cuthbert's Manor, Bedford.

IT may be said that perhaps the small number present at this meeting shows that the necessity for activity is removed—that the conflict is over, and that there is nothing more to be done in the work of Church defence. These premises are utterly untrue, and the conclusion is utterly false. If I were to adopt a parallel from the story of two nations that met in the conflict of warfare some twenty-five years ago, was not the lesson taught us this—that the nation which came into that struggle with the most complete and perfect organization ever known in the annals of European arms succeeded in inflicting a most crushing blow upon its previously irresistible rival? From that example we may take a lesson in the work of Church defence. The last speaker has certainly pointed out the true spirit of Church defence; but let us also make some practical efforts. Lord Selborne has sketched the programme of the Central Church Committee as promoted by the archbishops and the bishops; and I would like to throw out a few hints as to how that work is to be carried on. And, first of all, to those who minister in the different parishes throughout the length and breadth of the country, I would say that there might be introduced a word of preparation for this new body by the incumbents themselves. I may mention the resolution which I myself proposed at the Bedford Ruridecanal Conference, when it was resolved that in order to extend a better acquaintance with the history and work of the Church in the first place, it was desirable that the incumbents of parishes should occasionally take as the topics of their sermons the lives of some of our earlier British saints, and of the striking episodes of Church history connected therewith. Surely our own Church has its martyrs, and the glorious heritage of lessons to be drawn from their lives are not without their use and value even in this age. In the next place, the incumbents might introduce a series of lectures in the winter to illustrate periods of Church history, with or without a magic lantern; but I should say especially with the magic lantern in country places; and I would illustrate that from the words of an old preacher who

preached from the text: "Feed My sheep." He preached an admirable sermon. His language was very eloquent, but it was high above the heads of his hearers, and the practical effect was, that when an old farmer was asked what he thought of it, he replied that "there was but little food for the sheep, and I fear none for the lambs: you put it too high up." So I say that by the use of the magic lantern the lessons that we wish to teach may be brought more readily home to the minds of the people whom we desire to instruct in these matters. You should also work in the Sunday and night schools. I have observed that in the case of my own night school, the boys prefer Church history to anything else they have to do. Fourthly, you should introduce suitable books into the libraries, such as the works of Crake, Church, Yonge, and Marshall. And, fifthly, you should disseminate useful information by means of numerous lay-workers, who I find are ever ready to help on lines that are laid down for them.

The Rev. T. C. COLLINGS, Curate of Spitalfields, E.; Special Commissioner *Religious Review of Reviews.*

IT is at Principal Owen's desire that I have been asked to address you this afternoon. I was asked by the paper mentioned—the *Religious Review of Reviews*—and two or three other English papers, to go down into Wales as their special commissioner. I went there a rank Liberationist, disposed in favour of disestablishment and disendowment, but what I saw when I got there convinced me of the error of my ways, and I came back to London a National Church defender. I was struck with the fact that, especially in the Rhondda Valley, a bright and better day was dawning for the Church of England, inasmuch as the workingmen are now grateful for the ministrations of the parish church, and are beginning to see through the unhealthly dominance which the Nonconformist leaders exercise over them, not only in spiritual, but in temporal affairs. I had the advantage of staying, not only with country rectors and vicars, but also with leaders on the other side. I had full opportunities of hearing their opinions, and I came to the conclusion that we must not believe everything we read about the Church of England in Wales. I hope you will visit Wales and see into the matter for yourselves. Do not believe that the working classes are against you. That is one of the foulest and cruellest libels on the working classes. As Tom Mann said to me, "My boy, don't waste your time talking about disestablishment and disendowment. The working classes do not really want it, and those who do want it, want it only for the pounds, shillings, and pence, or to gratify their own ambitions." I say the Church of England is one of the most democratic institutions in the world, if only the laity will rally to the clergy and take their part in the work. Do not waste your time in a campaign of this sort, which would only be prolific of envy. The Vicar of Swansea gave me most remarkable proofs of a resurrection of Church life. Where only a few years ago there were but one or two churches, there are now thirty or forty, with a large number of mission rooms; and men and women are doing the best they can to bring the Church home to the people. As to politics and the pulpit, Nonconformists freely admitted to me that most of their ministers are local political agents, and one said to me, "Your bishops urge the clergy not to introduce politics into the pulpit on the Sunday, and thus the only opportunity on which the people come together is not availed of. Thus you play into our hands." I say that if God's Church is in danger, the clergy are justified in using the pulpit on Sundays in defending it, as well as taking the platform in the week; and I don't care if the whole Episcopate is against me. I say I should do it, and consider it right. As a socialist, and an extreme one, I say, "Do it, and so make your flocks enthusiastic defenders of the Church."

The Rev. GEORGE VENABLES, Rector of Burgh Castle; Hon. Canon of Norwich.

YOU who were here this morning, and are here again this afternoon, have either learned a great deal that is extremely interesting and useful, or have been confirmed thoroughly in knowledge of a character which you possessed before. Under these circumstances, I hope that you will all go forth and work. Do not let us lose one of the grandest opportunities God has given to the Church in Great Britain of so placing her in His sight before the people that she shall continue His Church until Christ

shall come again. My text at these Church Congresses, during the whole time that I have attended them—and I was at the first of them—has been one simple word, and that word I repeat to bishops, priests, deacons, and people alike—"adaptation." We want no change of doctrines; but the Church ought to adapt itself by a variety of processes to the varying conditions of the people, to the intellectual superiority of the people over what it was centuries ago, and to all the changes which the advantages of extended trade and commerce have brought to them. I say, let every parish possess its mission room, in which the laity can be well employed. Let the mission room have also a nice little chancel, where the parish priest may from time to time administer the sacraments. The noble Earl will forgive me if I say one thing a little contrary to a remark which he made. The noble Earl asked, "Where have they catechetical teaching connected with Church history?" Well, I have been a catechist for nearly half a century, and there has hardly passed a Sunday in my life, when at home, in which I have not catechized publicly in Church; and for a quarter of a century I have made it a rule that five minutes of the Sunday afternoon catechizing is devoted to Church history alone, besides preaching once a month a Church historical sermon. When I remember that the Bible contains such historical books as the Acts of the Apostles, and the records in Chronicles and Kings, I feel that it is quite consistent with my duty to teach my people how Christ's Name is known, and has been known, for ages past. And this is Church history. A good deal could thus be done, everywhere, every Sunday, in five minutes, by teaching a little Church history. I will only say one other thing. In all our work, let the people be made to feel that it is the real spiritual work which Christ gave His Church to do which we are prayerfully anxious to accomplish, and that nothing less than the preparation of the soul for eternity—for a glorious home—is our aim and object; and that we want to bring it about that people shall in this life have a knowledge of the truth, and in the world to come life everlasting. My friends—and I speak chiefly now to the clergy, and with great reverence and affection—I believe it is the truth that, once you can make a man believe that you have his eternal interests at heart, he will listen to you, and you may teach him anything you like.

GEORGE F. CHAMBERS, Esq., Eastbourne.

I DESIRE to emphasize what the noble Earl has said with regard to the dangers which now confront us. We have had in many places lately—I am sorry to say it—a general dissemination of the idea that the true policy of the Church for a long time to come is to "rest and be thankful." I am quite prepared to admit to the utmost the duty of being thankful, but I cannot admit the duty of rest. You must not suppose that, although the country has returned to Parliament a large majority who are in favour of the Church, the battle of Disestablishment is over for a quarter of a century. I believe it is nothing of the sort. The Radical party on many previous occasions have shown a wonderful amount of vitality, and they are now beginning to realize wherein they have failed, and what is to be done to prevent such a complete failure happening again? The question of the necessity for reorganizing their forces for future work is receiving great attention at their headquarters. I think, therefore, that we have still a very great amount of work to do. We must follow up what we have done by continuing to teach, not only the historical circumstances of the Church of England in the past. but by launching out into directions in which little has hitherto been attempted, namely, teaching the public that, supposing the Church of England were disestablished, the voluntary system, so belauded by the Dissenter, could never take its place. John A. James and other Nonconformist writers have left on record some curiously interesting and valuable information as to the tyranny exercised by the deacons over the ministers of Dissenting "chapels"; indeed there are many weak points in the Dissenting system, which I think it is our duty both to study and to disclose to the public. I have had a good deal of experience during fifteen years of lecturing in different parts of England, and one encouraging feature to me has been this: when the question of lectures in connection with Church defence was taken up a few years ago, the difficulty in most parishes was to get an audience, and often the most earnest whipping-up did not result in good audiences being obtained. But my more recent experience, especially last winter, is that audiences are ready in every place; that the people are willing and anxious to learn; and that the principal danger, as far as "classes"

are concerned, is not from hostility on the part of the working classes, but from the apathy of the upper classes; from, in fact, the provoking indifference of those gentlemen in black coats who will not alter their dinner hour in order to come and take the chair at, or otherwise assist at, Church defence meetings. These are the classes which we must try now to rouse. It will be our own faults if, at the end of six years, we find ourselves again fighting the question of Disestablishment at a disadvantage, because we have not bestirred ourselves during the intervening period.

The Rev. W. CEIDRYCH THOMAS, Vicar of S. Thomas' in the Moors, Birmingham.

I TAKE it that the chief object of this meeting is to intensify, or at least to keep from flagging, the interest of English Churchmen in the four dioceses known as the Church in Wales. My only claim to address it is that I am a Welshman who is working in England. You have heard from preceding Readers and Speakers what the Church in Wales was in the past, and what it is doing to-day; and now I want to say a word as to how the matter looks to a man who has left Wales some years ago, but who is still full of Welsh patriotism, who is taking every opportunity of trying to understand the real inwardness of the Church's position and progress, unprejudiced by local controversies, and who is anxious to bring into full view the true ideal for the future. And may I say one word as to the spirit in which we ought to treat Dissenters in Wales? I have felt, even this afternoon—I may be wrong in my impression—that one or two of the Speakers have not been quite free from that peremptory and arrogant spirit which is so much resented, and which accounts very largely for the alienation of Dissenters. It is not an uncommon tendency on Church platforms to regard all Dissenters as of one kind and calibre. It behoves us to remember that, as far as Wales is concerned at least, the apathy of the Church in days gone by has much to answer for. These two factors alone will account for the strong force of Dissenters arrayed against the Church in Wales at the present time. The first thing a doctor does is to diagnose a disease. It is for us to follow the medical method in dealing with Dissent. We shall then find that there are three kinds of Dissenters. We have those who are Dissenters by tradition; many are Dissenters for political purposes, and comparatively few who have become Dissenters by conviction. Having thus three kinds of Dissent, we should deal with them accordingly. The traditional Dissenter is always a possible Churchman. If he has the opportunity, he may be drawn to see things as you see them yourselves, whereas if you regard him as a person only to be fought, and not educated, you will foster the very thing you are anxious to uproot. I myself was brought up as a Dissenter, and might have remained so to the end of the chapter if it had depended upon the effort of the utterly unfit and incapable clergyman who was then in charge of the parish. There were shepherds in those days whose voice no earnest man could listen to, for their reputation was greater for drink than for feeding their flock. Happily, times have changed; but even yet we are only on the first rung of the ladder of progress in some of the rural parishes. English people have an idea that they have solved the difficulty when they see things are moving English-wise. But what suits the matter-of-fact Englishman will not always win the emotional Celt. Some of the best friends of the Church in Wales are apt to forget this. They live in Wales, they say, and they think they ought to know. But, with all deference, they are not Welsh enough to understand the real inwardness of the position. They don't see how matters look to a Welshman; a native of the soil, impulsive and easily moved, outwardly acquiescing perhaps, but probably inwardly unconvinced. The Welsh Welshman is a thing apart, and it behoves the Church in Wales to be so adjusted and adapted that Welshmen pure and simple must feel she has a mother's heart for them. The Church was never stronger in Wales, as was admitted in that never to be forgotten speech by the Archbishop of Canterbury at Rhyl, than when she captured the national sentiment; and she will be strong again, and stronger than ever when the old mother discharges her maternal functions with the warmth of love, which alone appeals to a Welshman's heart. Then we come to the question of patronage. We are all infallible when we talk of this most difficult subject. Churchmen may think that it does not interest or concern Dissenters. All I can say is, that few things have had more power to confirm the Welshman in his Dissent than the abuse of patronage, as he thinks, in the past. Dissenters in Wales feel—and they have not been backward in

expressing their feeling, and some Churchmen agree with them, though discretion in view of possibilities may dictate silence—that there has been far too much wire-pulling in the appointment of our Welsh bishops. That carries with it another consequence. Welsh, as compared with English, bishops have a large amount of patronage. Preferment to high office has fallen to the lot of those who have been especially loyal, which, being interpreted, sometimes means excessively obsequious. Impressions on this point may be altogether wrong. There will always be disappointments, however conscientiously patronage may be distributed. But it is a fact that in Wales much resentment has been vigorously expressed on platforms to large audiences, and in the vernacular press, that some of the best sons of the Church in Wales, although marked out by special endowments and qualifications, have been passed over, when inferior men have been brought to the front. How often have I heard the case of the greatly beloved one time Dean of Bangor instanced. He was regarded as one of the ablest men the Church in Wales had produced of late years, and it is no exaggeration to say that, humanly speaking, much of the present revival is due to the combination in him of undaunted patriotism and large-hearted but uncompromising Churchmanship. His great preaching power, his knowledge of the language and temperament of the people, his exceptional gifts generally, marked him out for the highest place, but his great worth was only tardily recognized, and, if report be true, he died almost broken-hearted, because he failed to persuade those in authority that the true patriot and the conscientious Churchman must be one, whereas they persisted in putting a premium upon a policy which anglicized and denationalized the Church at the price of strengthening Dissent. Well, be that as it may, the future must be different if the Church is to do amongst Welsh people the work of which she is capable. She must be manned, or souled, I would say, by her most earnest and capable men, who will be thoroughly loyal to her principles while genuinely sympathetic with the national temperament and the legitimate aspirations of the people. She must guard herself also against a danger which faces us in England as well as in Wales. We are suffering just at present from the machinery-multiplying craze. It is due to the great love for statistics, and the desire to be doing something. There is a great deal of forcible-feeble activity which is keen on adopting every new fad, while, in the language of a well-known writer, the truest work of our time is the vivifying of commonplaces. We have our Bible, our Prayer-book, and our Catechism, and we may well bestow more attention upon the rightful use of them than upon seeking vain novelties. Oh yes, there is a great deal of activity and fuss. We hear the loud din of machinery. But are we quite clear that the ultimate object of it all is kept in view, and that our spiritual results are commensurate with all this show of activity? What we want above everything is "the spirit within the wheels"—a great revival of spiritual life. We want powerful preaching, fervent praying, a reverent use of the sacraments, and we must not forget the opportunity of faithful catechizing. You will never satisfy Welshmen unless you give them preachers, preachers who have a message, and who know how to deliver it in a way acceptable and intelligible. Yes, and even in these days of multiplied attractions, nothing draws Welshmen so closely together as their prayer meetings. Dissent, in times past, fully recognized this, whereas the Church too long affected to despise it, and we know with what consequences. Thank God she has at last awakened out of her winter's sleep. Her pulpit is increasing in power, and daily prayer is being restored to its wonted place. Dissent, on the contrary, is becoming, I fear, increasingly "political," and is deleteriously influenced by the freethinking tendencies with which such an association brings them into contact. Its prayer meetings are less frequented, while the ablest of its preachers are drawn to English pulpits, where their stipend is larger and their opportunities greater. One word more. Faithful preaching leads up to a fuller use of the sacraments, and the opportunity of the Catechism prepares the way. Again, Dissenters, if they have not used *our* Catechism, have made full use of one based on Bishop Beveridge's. While the Church was apathetic, they did noble work in this way. In fact history, experience, everything tells us to make a fuller use of what we have as a rich legacy from the past, and that after all the chief end of the Church's existence is spiritual work, the salvation and sanctification of humanity. Upon this she will stand or fall. I have given my ideas plainly and bluntly for what they are worth. I believe I have given the true inwardness of the position as it appears to patriotic Welshmen; and without, I trust, more presumption than is justified by my special knowledge of Wales from the double point of view of Dissenters and Churchmen, and I venture confidently to predict that if we use our present opportunity as we ought to do, by reforming abuses and awakening to our responsibilities, the Church in Wales will

never be Disestablished, and those who are now divided will be by degrees brought together under her shelter; whereas if necessary and urgent reforms are ignored, knowing full well the strength and meaning of the opposition, I give her no more time than the present Government to live as established and endowed.

S. ANDREW'S HALL.

THURSDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 10TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

HINDRANCES TO CHRISTIAN UNITY—

(1) IN RELATION TO NONCONFORMITY;
(2) IN RELATION TO THE CHURCH OF ROME;
(3) IN RELATION TO THE CHURCHES OF THE EAST.

PAPERS.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

YOU will see that we have several important subjects which are to be debated this morning. I propose, therefore, to divide the matter. Nonconformity stands somewhat by itself, whereas hindrances to unity with regard to the Church of Rome and the Churches of the East may very well be taken together. I propose, therefore, first to take the papers on the "Hindrances to Christian Unity in Relation to Nonconformity," and then to discuss this question until 12.35, after which the papers with reference to the Church of Rome will be read, which will conclude the morning's sitting.

The Rev. T. P. GARNIER, Rector of Cranworth and Southburgh, Norfolk; and Hon. Canon of Norwich.

OUR subject is to be treated sectionally. Behind the several parts there is the whole. This must not be lost sight of in dealing with each part. Our conception of Christian unity as a whole is derived from that petition of our blessed Lord on the night of His betrayal: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one" (S. John xvii. 20, 21). It comprehends all, in all time. It contemplates not alone the reunion of Christendom as we see it now, divided and discordant—East and West, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Church and Dissent—but it also lays an obligation on the present not to break with the past. And if the retrospect of that past only reveals further disagreements and separations, yet it is incumbent on us to take up the thread of continuity in doctrine and order which will unite us with those, in every age, who have maintained their unity with the first for whom the Great Intercession ascended.

To come, now, to the prospect of Christian unity in relation to Nonconformity in this land. Any scheme for the closing of the breach between Church and Dissent, which had not for its ultimate aim the unity of Christendom, would fail to satisfy the terms of our Lord's own petition; it might, conceivably, even militate against its fulfilment. What He prayed for was the union of all, nothing less. This, then, must be the touchstone by which we are to test all proposals for local reconciliation. Unless they also make for the reunion of Christendom, they cannot claim on their own behalf that it was for this that the Son of God Himself pleaded with the Father.

With this provisional caution, I turn to the difficulties in the way. They are of two kinds. There are those that lie in Dissent itself, and those which belong more immediately to the Church.

To begin with those that are discernible in Dissent. First of all, there is that which lapse of time has inevitably brought with it. The leading Nonconformist bodies have now a history and literature of their own, adorned by many famous names, and round this historic conciousness the denomination has stiffened and crystallised. Then there is the legal difficulty involved in any re-disposition of trust-funds and fabrics held on a distinct tenure. Strictly speaking, so long as there are any, no matter how few, to abide by the distinctive tenets of the denomination, their claim to keep possession of the endowments would be sustained by the law of the land. To look in another direction, there is "a give and take" in the Nonconformist alliance with one great party in the State, which, in their assumed interest, has adopted an antagonistic attitude towards the Church. Let us admit it freely, it is asking a great deal to call for the sacrifice of so much political power and prominence. Another force that makes for religious disintegration, rather than union, lies in the social cleavage that has led to class-movements issuing in corresponding class-denominations. These are some of the hindrances to unity that lie in Nonconformity itself—historical, legal, political, social.

When we turn to the Church, there is the constantly repeated assertion that its connection with the State operates as a bar to reunion. And yet in our own Colonies, and in the United States of America, where this obstacle does not exist, there is no disposition to unite. On the contrary, the testimony of those who have lived there is that the strain between the various denominations is intensified rather than relieved.*

---

* "What I heard before I went out to Australia about the advantage of a Disestablished Church has been proved to me by experience to be simply illusory. It was said in Bradford, before I went out, by many of my Nonconforming friends, 'Only sweep away your Establishment, let us realize that there is no State Church, and then we shall come in and be one with you; we shall then realize that we are one body, and we can worship happily together.' What did I find? I went out to the land where was no State Church, where there was no Establishment, and did I find that happy state of things existed which it is prophesied will exist in England were the State Church, as they call it, to be removed, and were Disestablishment to ensue? I found that jealousies between the denominations were intensified, that the rivalries were increased, that it was nothing but a perpetual spiritual rivalry between this sect and that sect, and that so far from there being peace and harmony between the Church and the other denominations, differences between them were greater, or seemed to be greater, than they were in England, and the possibilities of reunion were much further away than they are here."—*Dr. Kennion, Bishop of Bath and Wells, formerly of Adelaide, Nov. 6th*, 1894.

Then we are told that no religious body would, at this time of day, consent to stultify its past by accepting Episcopal ordination for its ministers, in order—as we believe—to secure unbroken ministerial continuity with the Apostles of the Lamb. But here the concession called for would involve our own breaking with the past, and at the same time taking a step further away from those 280 millions of Christians who have preserved the Apostolic succession down to this day.* It would violate that principle from which I started, that the union contemplated in our Lord's intercession is not any kind of union, but being a union of all in all time, it must of necessity be a union dependent on the maintenance of the primitive faith and the Apostolic fellowship. We have no more right to break with the Christianity of the past, than we have to stand aloof from the Christianity of the present. On this ground, the last Lambeth Conference (1888), in its overtures to the Nonconformists, submitted, among the essentials of a possible basis of reunion, the *Historic Episcopate*. The other articles were the Holy Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and the Two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself.

From the hindrances that have been glanced at, together with the significant fact that this appeal from the English Church has practically met with no response from the Nonconformists, it will be apparent that anything like corporate reunion is not to be looked for under present circumstances.

Can, then, nothing be done? There is surely a strong religious element in Dissent to which we may address ourselves. There are those whose attitude would be something of this kind :—"I left the Church for Dissent (or, I continue in the separation in which I was born) because I believe I am therein nearer to God. If it could be shown that I should be nearer to Him in the Church, then the very same motive that makes me a separatist would make me a Churchman, cost what it may. Necessity would be laid upon me. I should have to make the change that I might save my soul alive."

Here, I venture to think, is the point to which we have to get back, if we are to reach the real hindrance with those in the ranks of Dissent whose return of all others we Churchmen should hail with great joy. If only we could win these, with their personal gifts of the Spirit of God, what strength they would bring to us. How they would supply some of those "diversities of operations" which are lacking in our own Church-life. How the cause of Christ would then go forward in this land. If only these who represent the religious life of Dissent could be drawn to us, it would not be long before others followed. It is therefore to these that we must address ourselves if any good is to be effected.

But let us not blink the issue between us. It really comes to this, that we do not agree in the truth of God's Holy Word, and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. As our own collect instructs us, the Church is built upon the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets, that we might be joined together in unity of spirit by their *doctrine*.† A unity which is not a unity of the faith can have no stability. If so, it

---

* Dr. Hurst gives the following statistics :—Christians, 407,000,000 :—131,007,449 Protestants ; 200,339,390 Roman Catholics ; 75,390,040 Orientals.

† S. Simon and S. Jude.

must not be the superficial unity of compromises. All partial concessions on this point or that, all paring off of the sharp edges of a dogma, is so much trifling with the question. And as to that boiling down of the various beliefs till a residuum be reached, called "Undenominational Christianity," in the first place, it is never really reached, for there will always be something left to object to; and, in the next, no one believes in it as a power that is to convert the world—all the savour is gone out of the salt. The unity for which Christ prayed, will be the holding of the faith in the unity of the Spirit, "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." It will be a living thing, this unity. The one life of the one Body, fed by the one Bread, issuing in one worship as the expression of that one Faith.

It is therefore to the parting of the ways in respect of doctrine that I would get back, for it is there that we shall find the real hindrance to reunion.

One recently acting as spokesman on behalf of his brother Nonconformists put it thus:—"The idea of conversion is taken to be normative of our soteriology, as baptismal regeneration is of the Anglican."* It is sufficient for my purpose.

I shrink from any attempt to state the Nonconformist case, lest I should fail to do it justice. But I will venture to indicate the bearings of our own position, which I shall be safe in saying is not theirs.

In a word, the Churchman's will be, primarily and essentially, a *life of reception*. As Mr. Gladstone in his book on "Church Principles" has put it—and he is speaking of the sacraments—"In the whole of our religion we are more specifically recipients than agents."† Here it is, I submit, that Nonconformists diverge from us. Trace their belief up to its essential idea, and we find it to be *Conversion*, in which man is the agent. Whereas the Churchman starts from *Regeneration*, which he looks upon as the free gift of God. Conversion, with us, is never in itself attainment. It is merely a stage. We, too, regard it as indispensable, but simply as being conditional to the unimpeded, and therefore full, reception of what are gifts of God; as when S. Paul, upon his conversion, was urged to be baptized and wash away his sins. Where his own effort would come in, would be to apprehend that for which he was apprehended by Christ Jesus.

The attitude of the Churchman, therefore, is distinctively one of *reception;* he is to open his mouth wide that God may fill it. He regards himself as a vessel to be constantly replenished with God's grace. The Scriptures speak to him of Christ being formed in him, of Christ living in him (Gal. ii. 20; iv. 19). He recognizes that this can only be the gift of God; of himself, he could never become a partaker of the divine nature. He recognizes that the utmost that he could look for from his own effort would be a slow and uncertain progress by *accretion*, as when the crystal is being formed. Whereas, what he can have by reception is *organic life*, and this will, and must, increase by the law of its own being, if it be not hindered.

This belief is reflected in the very arrangements of the building in

---

* Rev. Vernon Bartlet, letter in *The Guardian*, April 17th, 1895, p. 583.

† p. 177.

which he worships. There will be that pathway from font to altar symbolising the stages of the new life which he is receiving from God; and, at the side, there will be representations of the other means of grace, that he may "come behind in no gift." All points to a life of reception. It is his belief that Christ, when He ascended up on high, gave such gifts to men, and that they are to be had through the ordained channels. To him those ten days of Ascensiontide are no mere meaningless parenthesis, they are to set the attitude of the Christian disciple, in all time, as one of receptiveness and waiting upon God until he be endued with power from on high.

This, I will venture to say, is not how Christianity presents itself to the Nonconformist, for the opening sentences of the Catechism, so specially distasteful to him, are based upon this very principle of pure reception of what is the free gift of God.

The rest of the Churchman's belief is consequential upon this principle. Matters that have little or no interest for the Nonconformist, such as the validity of sacraments, of holy orders, the visible Church and its unity, the continuity of that branch to which he belongs, the primitive faith—in a word, all that bears upon the security of those gifts of grace—are of vital concern to the Churchman.

Churchman and Nonconformist alike have to try all this by God's Holy Word. They have to ask themselves, How can I receive of Christ's fulness and grace for grace? Where can I find the Church which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

Churchman and Nonconformist alike have to test this presentation of Christianity by its fruits. Can it lay claim to that organic Church-life which increases with the increase of God? Has it produced, and is it producing, the most devotional literature? Does it continue to call out the saintliest lives? There was one who more than fifty years ago wrote in these terms: "Among those that are severed from the unity of the Church may often be found a rigid morality, but little of the unearthly temper which marks the Catholic saints. We often see strict truth, integrity, and benevolence, but little of the conscious awe of God's invisible presence, the subjugation of passion, and denial of self, which distinguishes a saint from a philosophic moralist. We shall often see, likewise, much zeal, forwardness, and energy in action, but little of the meekness, self-withdrawal, and devout humility, which is the crowning glory of Christ's example. In fact, out of the unity of the Church we see the commoner virtues, which the world in part knew before Christ's coming, carried higher by the strength of Christianity; but of the higher graces which the world never dreamed of, and which were manifested in Christ only, we can find but faint lines anywhere except in the Church alone."*

These are the words of Henry Edward Manning, at the time Archdeacon of Chichester. We have all to face the question, whether or not this estimate be borne out by the facts. If there be any measure of truth in it, if there be such saintly lives among the Church's children, we know the secret. It is due to this life of reception. By the grace of God they are what they are—they have nothing but what they have received.

---

* "Unity of the Church" (1842), p. 243.

Is it without hope that in our sorely divided English Christianity there may yet be an approximation on so vital an issue? Are there not, as it is, signs that there are movements full of promise in quarters where we should least have looked for them? Such names as the late Dr. Milligan amongst the Presbyterians, and the late Dr. Dale amongst the Congregationalists, and I could add the names of eminent living Nonconformists, show that there is a leaven at work in this direction. May we not trace in it the operation of the One Spirit? Is it not the little cloud arising out of the sea which heralds the abundance of rain?

I have only one word more to say. We Churchmen are conscious of a hindrance in our own selves. We are dissatisfied when we reflect that we are giving up nothing. We are asking of others the relinquishment of old and cherished beliefs—we are making none ourselves. But if it is so, it is because as a Church we have made this sacrifice already, when we returned to the primitive Faith. And yet we feel it to be a real hindrance to reunion, that it involves no disinterested act on our part. It even wears the appearance of self-aggrandisement, that we should be calling upon others to conform to our own belief.

First, then, let us always be careful to make it plain that it is not Anglicanism as such that we would thrust upon Nonconformists. It is the principle behind Anglicanism, that appeal to primitive Christianity, or the voice of the Church while it was still one and undivided, to which we ourselves deferred at the Reformation, and are still ready to defer in all cases in which we suspect that our own system may be defective. It relieves the situation of a certain invidiousness, if we invite our Nonconformist brethren to seek the truth side by side with us. The quest should be a joint quest, in which they are to render servic eas well as we. The invitation of Moses to Jethro may be ours, "We are journeying unto the place of which the Lord said, I will give it you: come thou with us, and we will do thee good" (Numbers x. 29).

And, next, if as I believe there must be some act of self-effacement on the part of Churchmen before unity can be attained, may we not look to God to provide for us a sacrifice? It is a dream with me, that out of all this Disestablishment struggle, in which against our will we are involved, such an opportunity may arise. Whether it be after the assault has been finally repelled, or whether it be, if God so wills, after it has succeeded, there may come a time when the assault of the world is being launched against Nonconformist liberties or endowments. That will be the moment for Churchmen, forgetting all that is happening now, to fall into line, as one man, by the side of their Nonconformist brethren in defence of their rights. It may come in this form or in others, but God will see to it that such opportunities are not wanting to those who really desire them. In the meantime, every occasion should be seized to show a spirit of conciliation and kindliness. For example, the Wesleyans are, at this time, anxious to obtain legislation for their own body. Why should not the whole strength of the newly-formed Church party in the House of Commons aid them in so reasonable an undertaking, and send them an assurance to this effect? In these and other ways we may mutually lay down all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder godly union and concord, and be united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

In Relation to Nonconformity.

The Rev. Joseph Hammond, Vicar of S. Austell; and Hon. Canon of Truro.

I propose, with your permission, to devote this paper to the consideration of Nonconformist grievances; I will ask you calmly to consider the charges which they bring against Churchmen. It might, perhaps, be more gratifying were I to enlarge on their supposed obstinacy and perversity, but it would not be so edifying. Besides, we are taught, when we bring our gift to the altar, to remember what our brother has against us, not what we have against him. And the plan of discussing the stumbling-blocks which they find in our bearing and beliefs, rather than those which we discover in theirs, has this recommendation—that I shall not be admonishing the absent; I shall be addressing those who can apply the remedy.

Indeed, I could almost have wished, had the rules of the Congress permitted it, that some representative Nonconformist, such as Dr. Barrett, or Dr. Berry, or Mr. Price Hughes, could have stood in my place to tell us what are the obstacles to reunion from his point of view. Of one thing I am sure—that we should have given him a cordial welcome, and should have heard him patiently and with profit. We really want to see ourselves as Dissenters see us. But as this cannot be, the next best thing is that they should appear by proxy. I have therefore written to half-a-dozen leading Nonconformists, whom I have the honour to know, offering to hold a brief in their behalf, and promising faithfully to put before you the views which they should entrust to me. I fear, however, that I cannot be the sort of person they would have chosen for this office, as only two out of the six have favoured me with any observations. Still, the loss is not so irreparable as might at first sight appear, as I have been able to collect the complaints of the rest, and of Dissenters generally, from their writings and speeches. And these grievances I now proceed to state—of course in outline only: what more could I do in twenty minutes? especially as I want to exhibit our defence as well as their attack (they could not expect me to do less), and it takes much more time to answer objections than it does to make them.

But, first, I must explain to you why I shall say little or nothing about our doctrinal differences. Partly for the sake of brevity; partly because these have just been considered; principally, because I am persuaded that these are not the real obstacles to reunion. If we only hungered after reconciliation, these differences would not stand in the way for an hour. I believe that, doctrinally, the "orthodox Dissenter" is now nearer to us than he has ever been before. The old crude objections to the Church, to her rites and formularies, have one by one been silently abandoned. We seldom hear at the present day that the "Church is a synagogue of Satan," or that "her ministry is anti-Christian," or that her Prayer-book is popish, or that her clergy are "blind leaders of the blind." For a long time past there has been a gradual approximation to our teaching, even on the sacraments—so much so that many Dissenters are now hard put to it to find doctrines to dissent from. Moreover, the objections which they still allege are

largely built on misconception ; they can be removed, and will be, if we will only patiently and affectionately approach Dissenters with our explanations. But these must be given in the shape of treatises and tracts ; a Congress is hardly the place to discuss them. It is difficult, no doubt, to induce Dissenters to read our writings, and still more to reply ; it is noteworthy, and it has been remarked by Dissenters themselves, that no one has so far attempted to deal with the late Mr. Sadler's books, to which we all owe so much. I may perhaps be allowed to add that I have not heard of any reply to my own modest arguments and appeals. Still, I am full of hope as to the future ; the day is coming when they must and will hear us ; they will be compelled to do so in sheer self-defence. But it does not follow, even if we convince them of the Scripturalness of our teachings, that they will abandon their Dissent. "We have made a clean sweep," says a learned Calvinistic Methodist, "of the theological controversies which in our fathers' time shook earth and heaven, and the chapels erected in almost every village, chapel to the right and chapel to the left, in which the shibboleth of the sect must be pronounced to a nicety, now . . . remain as the tombstones of dead controversies." Yes, but though the controversies are dead, the splits remain, the breaches are not repaired. And so it would be amongst ourselves : so it would be, so long as our tempers and attitudes are what they are. For what really hinders reunion is temper ; it is the soreness, the jealousy, the antipathy, the downright hatreds which every secession, religious or secular, begets, which it breeds on both sides. This is where the difficulty lies—not because we, or they, are hopelessly heterodox, but because we, and they, have been so un-Christlike. If we had been inspired with His charity and patience we should long ago have found out a *modus vivendi*. "It is only," says Wesley, "when our love grows cold that we can bear to separate from our brethren." Until we are more candid, more charitable, more generous and chivalrous, any unity, that is worthy of the name, is past praying for. It is the "loud boastful talkers," the sayers of cutting things, the covert sneerers, the pens that are steeped in venom, that keep us apart and widen the breach. This is why I shall say nothing about doctrines, but confine myself to hindrances none the less real because they may seem to be more or less sentimental.

(1) Dissenters, then, to begin with, complain bitterly that we do not know either them or their teachings." "If," says one of my correspondents, "we were ancient Egyptians or Hittites, we might be better known. Many clergymen," he adds, "cultivate ignorance of Nonconformity, and are proud of it, and this offends." So does our "ignorance of their Church theories." He says that we do not know, and take no pains to learn, their doctrine of ordination, of unity, of schism. He says that "no heed is paid to their principles ; they are condemned unheard."

Now I think that this witness somewhat exaggerates, but I also think that he has hit a real blot. I am afraid that the bulk of us do know but little about Dissent, and I agree with my correspondent that we ought to know about it. We cannot do justice to it unless we do, and the more we deplore and dislike it, the more are we bound to understand it. Indeed, there are very few things, in my opinion, more

necessary for a clergyman to understand, and I venture humbly to suggest to our fathers in God that a careful study both of the history and doctrines of Dissent might well be exacted from our candidates for ordination. This would only be giving practical effect to one of the recommendations of the Lambeth Conference.

(2) A second complaint is that we misrepresent their motives. My correspondent instances the question of Church and State. He observes that we constantly assume that they are animated by a desire to injure the Church. He affirms that "the number of Nonconformists who would vote for Disestablishment and Disendowment, if they believed such measures would injure the spiritual efficiency of the Church, is so small as to be negligible." I am bound to say that I agree with him. I believe the great majority of Dissenters to be as honest as they are mistaken in this matter—and that is saying a good deal—and that we injure religion and postpone reunion when we credit them, largely or indiscriminately, with selfish motives. Of course there are Dissenters and Dissenters, but then there are Churchmen and Churchmen.

(3) A third and a very common complaint is that we are so narrow and exclusive in our religion. They think it strange that men who believe in the same God, read the same Bible, and sing the same hymns, will not worship with them in their meetings. Now here our reply is unanswerable; so unanswerable that it is always a marvel to me how Dissenters could ever take this ground. Our reply is that this is just what we were thinking, and have been thinking ever since they left us. Our reply is that we did not leave them, but they us. The separation, the standing aloof, is on their part. They said, by the very act of their secession, that we were not fit for them to worship with, and now they complain that we will not worship with them; we are the lamb that has fouled the stream. I respectfully and affectionately submit to Nonconformists that, in this particular at least, the boot is on the other leg.

(4) Nor can I recognize much greater justice in another charge, namely, *that we ostracize them*—I use their own word—ostracize them from society. This is a very sore point with them, and no wonder. They have even complained that Mr. Gladstone, *clarum ac venerabile nomen*, only asked their ministers to breakfast when the eggs were growing stale and somebody must eat them. But the answer to this is that we cannot help what society does and decrees. We are not responsible for its laws and usages. They might as well expect us to set the fashions, or we might as well complain that society does not receive some of the clergy and does receive some Roman priests. All the same, I should like to say that, in my opinion, we make a profound mistake if we do not cultivate the friendliest relations with Nonconformists. We ought to call on the ministers; it might do something to soften asperities if we did. Of every such advance it may be said, *Emollit mores nec sinit esse feros.*

(5) I now come to matters of much greater moment—to the "head and front of our offending." They complain that *we "unchurch" them*, by which they sometimes mean that we do not recognize their *communions* as "churches," and sometimes that we do not regard *them* as Christians. I take the latter first. I emphatically deny that any sane clergyman has ever said that they were not Christians; if he has,

perhaps they will give us his name. We could not do it, and the higher our sacramental views are, the less could we do it. We not only believe that they are Christians, but Churchmen—unconscious and, if you please, contumacious Churchmen, but Churchmen still—by virtue of that "one baptism" which admits men into the one Church. I say that, so far from "unchurching" them, we "church" them; it is they who unchurch themselves; who will have it that they are not members of the "one body," but of a brand-new Dissenting body. We recognize every baptized Dissenter as a Christian, and many of them as better Christians than we are. In fact, we assign them a higher place than they claim for themselves. They say they are members of Wesley's Church; we say they are members of Christ's Church. It is true that we deny, or at least I do, that their communions are Churches. But even so, I only do what they did themselves, most of them, a few years ago. All that they then claimed was that they were "connexions," or "associations," or "societies." The Wesleyan Conference of 1793, for example, professed that it "had no design of making the societies Churches"; the Conference of 1893 claimed that the society was and long had been a Church. But more: I only do what the New Testament does. On their own showing, it knows of no sectarian or denominational "Churches"; the only "Church" it recognizes is the visible society founded by our Lord, or a branch of that society. Yes, they allow that there was no Dissent, nor any provision for it, in New Testament times; all they can say is that the New Testament was written a long time ago, and that many things have changed since then—an observation which might have some value if God had changed, or man, or God's way of saving and blessing man. No, we cannot allow this novel claim. We can no more recognize "Churches many" than "Gods many" or "Lords many." Loyalty to Christ and love for Dissenters alike forbids it. But while this is so, we recognize all devout Dissenters as of the soul of the Church, and all baptized Dissenters as members of its body. We should insist, I think, in season and out of season, on these two points—that no new society can be God's Church, and that every baptized man is a Churchman.

(6) Still more offensive in Nonconformist eyes is the fact that so many of us deny the orders of their ministers, or, to use their own phrase, "stigmatize them as illegitimate." They say that "this should be impossible to a Christian heart." They point to their piety and ability and success as so many proofs of a Divine commission; they call it "arrogance" and "impertinence" on our part to question it. Now, what shall we say to these things? We say, first, that we allow them to be almost everything which they themselves claim to be. They claim to be Baptist or Methodist ministers; we allow it. They claim to have the gift of prophesying; we allow that. They claim to be as devout and eloquent as the clergy; we allow that. They claim to be called of God to the ministry; we do not even deny that. What we are compelled, respectfully and regretfully, to deny is, that they have been ordained bishops, priests, or deacons in the Church of God. And how can they wonder if we dispute their "orders," when they sometimes say themselves that "there are no such things as orders." They point to their eminent fitness for ordination—which we do not presume to question—but we reply that qualifications are one thing, and appointment

is another. Judas was an Apostle, though he was not fit for the post; Justus was fit, but he was not an Apostle. But, secondly, we point out that if we cannot recognize gifts, however eminent, and piety, however sincere, as proofs of lawful appointment, we only follow their own example. Do the Wesleyans recognize every pious and able and successful Wesleyan as a "minister" amongst them? Indeed they do not. They say that those men only are Wesleyan ministers who have been appointed such; appointed in the Wesleyan way, and with Wesleyan rites. There is not a single Dissenting body, so far as I know, which accepts qualifications as a proof of commission, and yet they are hurt and indignant if we decline so to do.

(7) One word on a kindred point. Some Dissenters feel aggrieved that they are denied access to our pulpits. It is simply a wonder to me how they could expect it. Their very name and position shows that they disagree with us; they dissent from our teachings and usages; they object to them so much that they cannot even be members with us. Then what do they mean by claiming to act as ministers? One day they say that the Church's ideas of religion are not theirs, and the next day they claim to air their ideas of religion in the Church's pulpits.

(8) On another point, however, I do think that they have some right to resentment. They complain that we ignore or undervalue the good work that they have done, "their missions, their philanthropy, their services to our country." I would not say that we have ignored it—certainly some of us have never done so—but I do fear that we have recognized it somewhat grudgingly. Yet there is no reason why we should do so, even if it were just and right to do it. The good work, the great work, which Dissenters have done, is no recommendation or justification of Dissent, and this just because it has been accomplished, not by virtue of their Dissent, but by virtue of their Christianity. There is no saving power in mere secession; if souls are saved, or lives are changed, it is by the power of God; Nonconformity cannot take the credit of it. And the less so, when we remember that all this work might have been accomplished without any separation at all—all the good might have been done, and the friction and the jealousy and the misery and the waste might have been avoided.

(9) Nor am I disposed to differ from Dissenters when they say that the Church needs to be reformed, or when they accuse it of being too worldly, or when they say that we clergy are by no means as spiritual or as earnest and exemplary as we should be; all this seems to me to "go without the saying." All ancient institutions require reforms from time to time; all Christian bodies are exposed to corruption; all ministers are miserable sinners. But I respectfully ask them, if they feel these things so strongly, why did they leave us, or why do they not now help us. If they could prove that the Church was in a deplorable state, I should reply that, on their own showing, they are largely to blame for it. They tell us that they have more life and zeal and fervour than we. But this simply means that they have taken all this life and zeal and fervour out of the Church—taken away the very leaven which might have leavened the whole lump. So with reforms. If they are so urgent and so imperative, why do they not help us to secure them? It is no secret that some of them have resisted them. I repeat: we may admit every charge which Dissenters bring against the Church, and still hold Dissent

mainly responsible for them. We might have been preserved from these evils had they remained with us or returned to us.

(10) One point more, and my task is done. They constantly accuse us of petty persecution. They say the squire and the parson make the lives of some Dissenters a burden to them. They also say that we make proselytes by underhand means. These serious charges, to our great shame and sorrow, our fellow Christians constantly bring against us. Are they true? I cannot say; but one thing I can say—that they never by any chance give us the means of proving or disproving them. They never give us any particulars; they only make vague and general accusations against the clergy as a class. And I submit to you, and I submit to them, that this is most ungenerous and most unjust. If they can prove them, then they ought so to do; if they cannot, then they ought never to make them. And the same remark applies to the charge of priestism and sacerdotalism. These accusations are constantly flung in our teeth by men who have no idea what they mean by the words. If they can define the terms, if they can bring a specific charge against us, then they ought to do so; if they cannot, then they ought never to insinuate one. I am anxious, deeply anxious, to remove every Nonconformist grievance, but I must say I think that Nonconformists have lessons to learn, and wrongs to remedy, as well as ourselves.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. H. SUTTON, Vicar of Aston, Birmingham.

IT is a commonplace to say that there may be unity without uniformity, and uniformity without unity. It is equally obvious that Christians weaken their witness for Christ, waste time, talent, energy, money, impair their power to destroy Satan's strongholds, by divided counsels and internecine contests, as a consequence of their unhappy divisions. It is not my business, however, to prove that Christian unity is desirable; that would be to "paint the lily." I have to consider what are the hindrances to such unity in relation to Nonconformity.

I.—I put first, indifference to its importance; this notwithstanding much that may seem to point in a different direction. The number of Nonconformists who really feel that this is a question of the hour is small. In 1892, Mr. R. F. Horton said, "I do not wish to see any section of the Christian Church abolished, because there is just as much necessity for the existence of each of them as for the Church of England itself." I wonder did he include in his optimistic view of the question each of the five sections into which Plymouth-Brethrenism is said to be divided in the ancient city of Carlisle.

Again, the *Independent and Nonconformist* of October 3rd, referring to the address of the President of the Congregational Union, deprecates the attention given to the question of reunion, "lest the prominence given to it should foster the feeling which is abroad that it is really occupying the attention of Congregationalists." "Such an idea," it adds, "would be a mistake. Indeed, there are not a few who believe that more than enough time has been spent upon mere sentiment." This does not look as if that organ of Congregationalism attached much importance to Christian unity. More significant still is the fact that no speech seems to have been received with such enthusiastic applause at Brighton as that of Mr. Hollowell, who ridiculed the idea that Nonconformists were going to "trot two-and-two into some great ecclesiastical

ark." He feared there would be great overcrowding. It was not probable that the family would be a happy one. The spiritual death-rate would, no doubt, be high. An unprincipled amalgamation of Churches opposed to each other in vital truths would be an imposture amongst men and an offence to God.

Deep down in many minds is the dread that the unity for which some so eagerly long might crush thought, limit liberty, promote persecution, silence some who have a real message from God for the world. The history of the past shows that such fears are not without foundation in fact. But public opinion ripens fast in this age. Indifferent as the majority are at present to the question of Christian unity, that indifference will cease if it is shown to be "within the range of practical politics."

II.—The second hindrance I believe to be—loyalty to the past. Churchmen have little idea with what pride and reverence Nonconformists look back at their past history. The persecutions their forefathers endured, the courage, faithfulness, and self-denial they displayed, awaken an enthusiasm to-day which retains many within the ranks of Nonconformity. The meeting of the Congregational Union furnishes me with proof that I am not over-estimating this feeling. A speaker who pleaded very powerfully for a better-paid ministry in country places, said: "It is a poor thing if the descendants of the men who built up the American Republic, with Plymouth rock as its corner stone, cannot sustain the men who are in the outposts, fighting now against a revival of sacerdotal persecution and bitterness which is as cruel as that which sent John Penny to the gallows, and the men of *The Mayflower* to die in a foreign land." These words were received with loud applause. But no speech was so enthusiastically cheered as that of Mr. Hollowell, who, amongst other things, said: "The fathers of the Nonconformist Churches have not been pigmies. Though no longer here in the flesh, they speak to us from the library shelf and from the page of history. We are proud to be of the lineage of Cromwell, Milton, Owen, Baxter, Howe, Flavell, De Foe, John Robinson, the Pilgrim Fathers, Philip Nye, and John Bunyan." We must remember that this is just the sort of sentiment to appeal to the more high-minded, pure-hearted, unworldly young people of Nonconformity. Closely allied with it is love for parents, reverence for good men and women, whose lives are "a living epistle, seen and read of all men," and surely not least by those who know them best.

III.—A third hindrance is the mutual misunderstandings of Churchmen and Nonconformists. These misunderstandings hinder the sort of union which, without being all that we desire, yet would minimize the evils of the present state of things. They arise partly from (1) lack of personal intercourse. May we not take shame to ourselves in this matter? Have we been as courteous as we might have been? Have we not stood aloof from Nonconformists, as if we were very superior persons? Have we never given ourselves airs which must have been very provoking to men who (so short-sighted are some men!) may have failed to recognize our vast superiority to themselves? All honour to the Archbishop of York and to the Bishop of Worcester for the kindly courtesy they have shown to Nonconformists. There would be much more hope of Christian unity if their example were more generally followed. (2) So far as Nonconformists are concerned, a fruitful source of disunion is misunderstanding of the true teaching of our Church. They think that Romish error looms large in her teaching and her ritual. Is it wonderful that they should so think? There are clergymen who are proud as peacocks to be mistaken for Romish priests, who would consider it a deadly insult to be supposed to be Nonconformist ministers. They hate the very name Protestant; they abuse the Reformers; they put into the hands of their people manuals which, to quote the Archbishop of Canterbury,

"do not even halt at mediævalism, but merely reproduce modern Roman innovations in ritual and doctrine."

Do you doubt whether this coquetting with Rome is a serious hindrance to Christian unity, so far as Nonconformists are concerned. Listen to words cheered to the echo the other day at Brighton. "It is not the desire for religious equality alone that keeps Nonconformity alive: it is rather love for truth and concern for our liberty in Christ. State favour and control are bad, but there is something worse, and that is to put man in Christ's place, to demand confession to a priest, to teach salvation by ceremony, to say that grace only flows through a conduit of ritual and the mock offering up of Christ for sin every Sunday morning. These things are worse than establishment, though establishment makes them more hateful and pernicious. When the Church is free, we shall still be found protesting against Sacramentarianism. Therefore, we are not leaving Nonconformity. It will not leave us; it is in our blood."

This sort of language, and the loud cheers it evokes amongst Nonconformists, are a proof (1) that Nonconformists misread our formularies; (2) are confirmed in such misreading by the teaching of not a few in our own Church; (3) are kept from even considering the question of reunion by their not unnatural hatred of what seems to them rank Romanism. Alas! the very men who most long for—and are most earnest in praying for—Christian unity, are themselves the greatest stumbling-block to Christian unity, so far as it concerns Nonconformists. I, for one, deny that men need keep outside the Church of England in order to protest against false teaching about the Church and the sacraments. The great mass of Nonconformists, if they rightly understood the teaching of our Church, would find few difficulties in the way of return to her bosom. Some of these misunderstandings seem wilful. Surely Nonconformists must know that many High Churchmen, to say nothing of Evangelicals, have no sort of objection to a prayer-meeting, or to extempore prayer in the sick room, the home—in fact, anywhere except in church. Yet the speaker I have already quoted declared, and was applauded for the declaration, that Nonconformists could not leave Nonconformity because they could not consent to give up their prayer-meetings.

I have no time to deal with a fourth hindrance (perhaps the greatest of all)—vested interests. The hindrances are great; are they insuperable? It has been nobly said that "the impossibilities of one generation are the conquests and the triumphs of another. It may be a dream and an ideal which is presented to us; but a dream may have its glory and its accomplishment, and an ideal may have its high inspiration. The world would be poor indeed without its dreams and its ideals. They come to us 'apparelled in celestial light.'"—These are the words of the Bishop of Worcester. The time will come when our unhappy divisions will cease.

DISCUSSION.

E. Roberts Tuxford, Esq., Norwich.

It was with some hesitation that I ventured to claim a layman's privilege to say a few words to this Congress, but I am encouraged by the remarks of Canon Hammond. He regretted that owing to the necessary Congress rules we could not have the Nonconformist position put before us by Nonconformists themselves. I stand here as a loyal Churchman, but one whose relatives are still very strongly mixed up with Nonconformity. I have, therefore, had an opportunity of seeing some of the things of which Canon Hammond has spoken, and observing perhaps more closely than has fallen to the lot of some of our clergy the inner workings of Nonconformity. I should scarcely be a true Churchman if I did not hope and pray for

reunion with Nonconformists and all sections of the divided Church as fervently as anyone here; at the same time, I venture to think that some of the speakers have slightly underrated one of the hindrances to unity—namely, the difference of doctrine. One of the Speakers has stated that the difference of doctrine is not one of the main obstacles; but in many cases it is. In the short time at my disposal I will speak of that body which I have had an opportunity of observing very closely—namely, the Congregational body. Although I am prepared to admit that they are further away from Church discipline than some communities, still they are a type of Nonconformity, and a very important body to reckon with. Some of the differences between ourselves and Congregationalists can perhaps be explained with a little more mutual consideration, but there are some which are distinctly *de fide*; and I venture to say that the Church of England cannot give away any of its faith in the hope of bringing in Dissenters. When I tell you that the Congregationalist body, or at any rate some of their chapels, admit members to the full privileges of that body without baptism, the feeling of the Congress will go with me when I say it is a very serious thing. Not only does this occur when it is difficult to ascertain whether baptism has taken place, but also in the case of those who have been connected with one chapel all their life, and whose history is known. This leads to great carelessness; and I will quote an instance to illustrate the prevailing tone of thought. A short time ago enquiry was made at a chapel as to whether a person was baptized there or not, but no registers were found. Upon asking the Congregational minister's widow with respect to the matter, she stated that her husband's record of baptisms ceased with the compulsory registration of the birth of children: she remarked, "When the State took over that duty we felt it was no longer necessary for the chapel to keep a register." That was the opinion of an otherwise educated woman, whom all esteemed on account of her many good qualities. While a Christian body can take such a view of baptism, there is something very seriously wrong. I might quote examples of the Congregational Union of the county making grants to poor congregations for the support of their minister; yet when those grants are allocated, if the congregation becomes dissatisfied, they may complain of the preacher's unorthodoxy and get him removed on the verdict of a committee, many of whom would not profess to be theologians, and in spite of the fact that he has never been required to subscribe to a creed at all. If a lay preacher takes a service at a country chapel on "sacrament Sunday," he may be told by the deacon (corresponding somewhat to our churchwardens) that the sacrament should be celebrated, and is informed, "If you do not do it, I shall." Therefore, they have not any very definite sacramental teaching, and do not pretend that it should be in the hands of ministers ordained according to their form. Enough has been said to illustrate the fact that there is a great difference in doctrine and practice between Nonconformist bodies and the Church. I will conclude with the splendid, though unconscious, tribute of a dear old lady to the truth of our position. In some anxiety as to the way I was going, she said, "Don't read Catholic books; if you do, you will be converted."

The Right Hon. the EARL NELSON, Trafalgar, Wilts.

I HAVE very few remarks to make, but from my well known interest in this question, I thought it my duty to send in my card. I want especially to enforce upon you the great truth that was put forth by Canon Garnier—namely, that union of all Christians is the only thing that we ought to have before us; and that any union short of the union of all would be a misnomer, and would not have the blessing which we all expect from the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer. He (Canon Garnier) referred to the history of Israel in Egypt; so would I. They might have come out of Egypt much sooner, but the order was, "Not a hoof is to be left behind"; and though in our desire for unity we might be tempted to give up some of the truths which would damage our position for the larger unity, we should not really advance the cause; we must have patience and faith, and not sacrifice the noble position in which our Church stands for unity with our Protestant Nonconformists. At the same time, there is one very great truth that I think must be borne in mind. We can never properly enter into negotiation with the ancient churches East or West as long as we ourselves are a divided body; therefore, it is essential that we should do what we can to come to an understanding with all the really religious-minded Nonconformists round about. There is one thing we have to aim at in Christian unity. Christianity is a very

catholic, large-hearted thing. There is room in Christianity, when surely based on the foundation truths, for a large amount of liberty, and unfortunately, our disunion has taught us to make much of little differences, and given us small hearts; whereas, if we could but really meet on foundation truths, we might willingly admit differences on minor matters, and allow that those holding parts of one great truth might be doing a great work, and helping to build up the whole truth, however much we might differ from their particular exaggerations. Those are some of the things that we ought to bear in mind. If we want unity—if we want to understand one another, and to remove all hindrances, we must try with that large-heartedness that I have spoken of, and we must try, each one of us, to grow up after the likeness of Christ, to have His self-denial, to have His love, to have His humility; and when that is the case, we shall recognize and give justice to the views of all, and, rallying round the faith, give a true witness of Christ's loving work to all the world.

The Rev. HERBERT WILLIAMS, S. Matthias', Earls Court.

IT seems to me that one of the great difficulties that hinders us from drawing in the Protestantism of this country into the unity of the Church and her doctrines and discipline, is the want of unity that exists amongst us Churchmen. We are far too many of us Congregationalist, and although Churchmen ought always to feel at home wherever it may please God to call them, far too many are under the impression that all the blessings of God's Church are only to be obtained under that roof where they are accustomed as a rule to worship. The learned canon who read the paper just now spoke in a way that he ought not to of a great number of earnest-minded Christian English Church clergy. He said they were teaching what he cannot prove. He put before the Congress opinions that are likely to separate us one from the other, instead of drawing us into closer union, that we may be one, and that we may show that we are asking others to come into a body that is perfectly at one with themselves. That learned canon would have done much more towards Christian unity had he asked one of us—whom he looks down upon as a very dreadful lot of people—to go into his church and preach, and perhaps to listen to him speaking to us afterwards in his study as to what he believes to be the truth. But instead of holding out the brotherly hand of friendship to us, trying to learn what it is we really believe to be the truth of God's book that He has placed in our hands, and our book of orders, the book of Common Prayer; time after time in newspapers and before Congress meetings he holds us up to the ridicule of the ignorant. By so doing he prevents us gathering into the tent those who are out in the cold, out in the storm and tempest of this world. We hear of Isaiah speaking as the word of God, saying, "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtain of thy habitation; spare not, lengthen thy cords." He is speaking of that love, of that sympathy, that we are to shed abroad all over the earth to draw all in, that they may receive the same blessings as ourselves. But mark you, Isaiah says "Drive in the stakes." That tent that has not the stakes driven in will not be able to stand the storm that it will soon be subjected to. John Wesley went out to enlarge the place of his tent. He stretched forth his curtain. He said, "Come under this erection"; but he forgot to drive in the stakes, and so the tent that was to be a covering for all that came beneath its shelter soon gave way, and was split into twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty different tents, which could provide no shelter worthy of the name. And so, if we are to ask our Nonconformist brethren in Christ to come under the tent of the Church, we must drive in the stakes. By the stakes I mean we must not speak with an uncertain voice; we must proclaim the great principles and doctrines upon which the Church is built; we must speak with that trumpet that gives no uncertain sound. The Nonconformists have no respect whatever for men who play with them and who make out that there is no difference, or hardly any. They respect what some would call the ritualists, and those who are very pronounced and very determined in what they believe to be the truth. I believe, from my heart, that it will only be those who are at present called very advanced Churchmen who will, in any numbers, draw in the Nonconformist brethren who are separated from us to-day. They know that there is a great difference between ourselves and them; they see that we are in many ways quite opposite to themselves, and that we teach much that they do not as yet use their power of faith to believe in, and in us they see something that is above them; and I feel that in that way they are drawn closer to us. I venture to believe that we who are called the advanced Churchmen in the land gather under the fold of the

Church ten times as many Nonconformists as our Low Church brethren at the present time.

The Rev. JOSEPH MCCORMICK, D.D., Vicar of S. Augustine's, Highbury New Park, N.; Canon of York.

THERE are certain hopeful signs in connection with our subject at the present time which I should like to refer to. We all of us admire the great effort that has been made by Lord Nelson in endeavouring to gather together representative Nonconformists to discuss this question calmly, and though some of us may differ to some extent with Dr. Lunn on the other side, still the fact that he did his best to bring those who have differences of opinion together, in order that they might clearly understand the position taken up by each person, is very satisfactory. It so happened that this year I had my summer holiday at Grindelwald while the Conference was going on, in which I took no part; but I went at the conclusion of one of the meetings, and there I heard very much the same sort of teaching that has fallen from the lips of Canon Hammond—not that I agree for a single moment with a large proportion of the things that Canon Hammond has said. There was a Baptist minister addressing the Conference, and he said that there was to be no unity unless everybody was dipped. In the second place, he recognized no ecclesiastical history at all: that he threw into the waste paper basket. In the third place, he let us know that there existed no such thing in the Church of God as ordination, except by the Holy Spirit. If a man seeking for unity makes these assertions, the case is absolutely hopeless. There are, however, some cheering signs, and I will point out one or two. In the first place, the language of Mr. Spurgeon towards the conclusion of his life was encouraging. He virtually said this, that the Articles of the Church of England had been a safety against the downgrade movement. I understand that His Grace the Archbishop of York talked about modifying our Prayer-book and some of the Articles. This reminds me of the old Bishop of Cashel—"Bob Daly." They asked him to go in for revision of the Prayer-book, and he replied, "Who is going to do it? If they let me revise the Prayer-book, I can do it beautifully; but if they ask me to allow Convocation to do it—I have no confidence in Convocation—and I shall not agree." But there is this to be said in connection with the topic that is of very great interest: should there be any attempt to alter the formularies of the Church of England, or the doctrinal standard of the Church of England, there will not be unity, but division from one end of the country to the other. Another thing that is hopeful is the language that has been used by the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes. He has gone so far in connection with the education question as to say that a large body of Nonconformists are quite willing to admit the teaching of the Apostles' Creed in the elementary schools. That is a step in advance; because some time ago Nonconformists were openly opposed to the use of a creed of any kind. I hope that the opinion that has been expressed by the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes will spread throughout large masses of our Nonconformist brethren. Another thing that is hopeful is the declaration of Nonconformists themselves, that they are losing ground throughout the country. As long as Nonconformists do real work, there is no one to find fault with them. But this is a testimony that the Church of England is the best system for working among the people of the land: in the correspondence that has taken place in the press, there are assertions of this fact, that a Nonconformist minister keeps himself in his study, whilst a clergyman of the Church of England goes and visits different houses, and so he gains the sympathy of the people, and even of those who belong to the Nonconformist communities. But there is a third point that is hopeful, and that is a desire for intercommunion so frequently expressed. The other day, in speaking at Oxford, Canon Gore made a statement to this effect, that Nonconformists were now beginning to speak of the true Church of Christ as a visible Church. I do not know where Canon Gore got his information from; but I have had intercourse with Nonconformists all my life, and I am glad to count them my brethren; and I never met a Nonconformist who did not maintain to the bottom of his heart that the real Church of Christ was invisible, and consisted of the company of all faithful people. I do not think the Nonconformists are making advance in the direction mentioned by Canon Gore, but there is a longing desire that there should be a closer union. Previous speakers, however, have touched upon that point, so I will pass it by. There is another hopeful sign to which I wish to call attention. There is a growing feeling amongst Nonconformists that, in spite of what has been said in days gone by, the Church of England is the freest and most tolerant Church in Christendom. My dear friends, it is a truth that some of the cultivated ministers amongst

Nonconformists are smarting under the government of the communities with which they are associated. A Nonconformist of intellectual power and of remarkable cultivation told me that he sometimes was dictated to by the very baker that he employed, and that he was under the finger and thumb of uneducated men, and that it grated upon him as a Christian and an independent man. The Nonconformists are learning that, whatever faults there are in the Church of England—and the faults have nothing to do with its constitution and formularies—there is the greatest liberty. The Nonconformists have come to the conclusion that the Church of England is the freest Church, and that the clergymen of the Church of England are placed in a position of independence, where they can speak the truth of God without fear or favour. Now, for a moment, let me speak of the obstacles in the way of reunion: and first I place sacerdotalism, not for the purpose of introducing controversy, but because one of the most gifted of Nonconformists within the last few days made the observation to me that, "as long as there is sacerdotalism in the Church of England, we cannot possibly go in for full union." I do deprecate the language used by Canon Hammond. He ventured to assert that the Nonconformists did not thoroughly understand what they mean by sacerdotalism. They are not fools, and they read books as intelligently—many of them at any rate—as members of the Church of England, and they have the catechisms and the books in their hands of those who assert doctrines that are assimilated to the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and not the doctrines of the Church of England. Therefore, it is not fair to say that they are ignorant of what sacerdotalism is. They are as capable of judging to-day as we ourselves that sacerdotalism is a great hindrance to union. Another hindrance to union is the connection between Church and State. I am sure that this is a difficulty in the way of some Nonconformists. In contrast with the opinion of Canon Gore, the vast majority of Nonconformists believe that the Church of Christ is a spiritual body, and, taking up that ground, they think that union with the State is an unholy alliance. I am not going to argue the question, I am only stating it as a hindrance, and for this reason they go in for Disestablishment. It is not very long ago that the Dean of Armagh was speaking on the question of Disestablishment at Grindelwald, and he told the story of a man who fell among thieves, when one of the Nonconformist ministers remarked that he had to congratulate him upon the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. He said that a certain man fell among thieves, he was robbed, beaten, and almost killed, and then taken to an hotel where he was nursed and his wounds were attended to. By and by some gentlemen came to visit him, and these gentlemen were the men that had robbed and beaten the poor fellow until he was nearly dead, and they made this observation: "You ought, my dear fellow, to be extremely obliged to us, for if we had not nearly killed you, you would not be in this comfortable hotel, where you are receiving so much kindness and attention." That is the ground taken up by Nonconformists with regard to the English Church—that we are to thank them for robbing us of what belongs to us, because of the benefit we shall derive thereby.

The Rev. C. R. Lloyd Engström, Rector of S. Mildred, Bread Street, E.C.; Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society, Buckingham Street, Strand.

This subject of reunion has been for the latter half of my life quite a passion with me, and I have had opportunities, perhaps more than most of my brethren, of coming into very close contact with Nonconformists. It is, therefore, on this ground that I venture to address a few words to the meeting this morning. The two points which I wish to press upon you are—(1) the great duty of love, and (2) certain very practical considerations. (1) There is, of course, no difficulty about reunion between a Churchman who is not thoroughly a Churchman—that is, has no true appreciation of Church views—and a nominal Nonconformist who does not care about any special points of Nonconformity; but I have observed that non-evangelical "Evangelists"—and I am sorry to say I have met with a great many such—and also narrow High Churchmen; and also many of the Broad Church party, who are pleased to look upon Nonconformists as "Philistines"—do not care to try to understand and appreciate what Nonconformists are doing. On the other hand, I have observed, and I have no doubt many of you have observed it also, that a man may be a Churchman to the very root, a man who is in the deepest sympathy with everything that is most Catholic in the Church of England, and that he will have no difficulty in entering into the friendliest relations with Nonconformists. I will give you two instances:—the Archbishop of York, and Mr. Ring, when rector of Hanley; who both for som-

years have shown a beautiful spirit of love towards Nonconformists. It is also true that very often it is very hard to feel quite at ease in these relations. For instance, in the matter of education, I think Nonconformists, generally from ignorance, have been frightfully unjust to the Church of England with regard to what she has done and suffered to bring the young to Christ. But it is not my object to-day to point out the faults and sins of those outside us, but to suggest a more perfect way for ourselves. I think it was the great Coleridge who said that "you could never hope to bring a man over to your views unless you could get inside his views." I would beseech you, my brethren, especially the clergy, to try as far as it lies in your power to understand Nonconformists, by coming into contact with them in a spirit, not merely of love, but of humility. Be willing to learn of them, and ever look at their best side; because we would like to be judged by our best, would we not? Take them, then, at their best, which we can do without giving up a jot of our own principles, and you will come to love them all, the true Christians among them, as brethren. I believe if this principle were carried out, the day of reunion would rapidly come. I happen, as a member of this Church Congress, to have had a real privilege. I have been entertained with the greatest hospitality and kindness conceivable by himself and his wife—both hitherto unknown to me even by name—in the house of a leading Baptist minister in Norwich, the Rev. J. H. Shakespeare. I only wish all of you could have had the opportunity of hearing what has passed between us in conversation on the points which separate Baptists from Churchmen, and of knowing how lovingly he regards the Church of England, not only when speaking to me, but when speaking to his Nonconformist brethren, and I am sure you would be drawn towards men like Mr. Shakespeare. (2) I fear that the view generally taken by the clergy, especially in country parishes, where, besides the clergyman there are two or three Nonconformist ministers, is that they are unmitigated nuisances. They are looked upon only as very troublesome people, sometimes even as a sort of "kittle cattle," and there is a decided feeling that it would be better if they could all be got rid of. Now it would be most unjust to say that there is no ground for this feeling. I hold no brief for Nonconformity; but I think Christian love and a desire for concord should teach us to bear with great patience and forbearance and loving kindness the friction and obstacles produced by elements alien, and often bitterly opposed, to our own Church life. The friction is often very great, but the great thing for us to do is to bear with loving patience such difficulties which lie in our way. With regard to another matter—the Church of England is naturally more or less conservative, and justly so, because the very momentum of a great communion with a great past tends to conservatism; but there is also embedded in the very foundation of Christianity the spirit of Christian liberty which tends to individualism. The Church of England has never been quite able to see its way to doing what the Church of Rome has so very wisely done, notwithstanding her still greater communion and momentum, namely, the giving opportunities to those who have great spiritual enthusiasm to break out in various directions without rending the unity of the Church. To see how the Church of England may draw and keep all spiritual forces within her own communion is a problem of the highest importance, and of immense difficulty. But recollect that these forces exist, and many are at present outside us. Let me give you one instance. Last night—I hope you will not be very much shocked—I was at the anniversary meeting of the Pleasant Sunday Afternoon gatherings, held every week in Mr. Shakespeare's church. I ought to explain that it was a meeting, not a service, and that the P.S.A. is entirely distinct from the regular congregation which meets to worship there, and that from gratitude to my host and sympathy with him in his spiritual efforts, and also to see for myself what he was doing, I went to the meeting. Now if any of you had been there and had seen the immense amount of Christian feeling and of practical piety evinced, and the devoted efforts exerted to make the slums of Norwich seed-plots of such lives and influences as will make us prouder of the name of Englishmen and Englishwomen, I think, while you would have given anything that all this—in which, mind, there was not one single atom of feeling or acting antagonistic to our Church—might be brought into and harmonized with the Church of England, you would not have dared to even wish that any of it should cease to be because, if with us, it was not of us. France, in expelling the Huguenots, deprived herself of that grand Puritan element which would have enriched her and given her stability. Oh, that we could by some means draw back into our Church that noble Puritan enthusiasm and sturdy individualistic testimony to God which at present largely energizes beyond our borders. With regard to actual outward reunion, it seems to me that the

Congregationalists—but this applies only to them of all large Christian bodies—are in their very principle opposed to it. I do not see how an Independent can even wish for such a union. But wherever we see the spirit of reunion working, as for instance when Wesleyans are seeking to close up their ranks, let us never indulge in the unworthy fear that thereby they will become more dangerous to us because more united; but let us rather thank God because the very spirit of union which is thus working amongst Nonconformists will hasten the day when, perhaps, drawn together by persecution, we may in God's good time discover some means of universal reunion; that happy day when our constant prayer—would that it were more fervently and faithfully offered—shall be fulfilled, and "all who profess and call themselves Christians shall be let into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

The Rev. HENRY TEMPLE, Rector of Oswaldkirk; Canon Residentiary of York.

I NEVER knowingly and wilfully disobeyed a bishop in my life; but I confess I do feel startled when, after coming straight from the Agricultural Hall this morning, just at the very tail end of this meeting, and having heard no words except those of the last speaker, and a very few of my friend Canon McCormick's closing words, that I should be asked in a sort of way to wind up this debate, and to say what is the proper attitude of the Church towards Nonconformists with reference to any hopes of reunion. But, still, my rules are always these with regard to any work that is proposed: First of all, "do not volunteer," and, secondly, "do not shirk." "Do not volunteer unless volunteers are called for; do not shirk unless you are undertaking work which stands in the way of pressing duty." This being my position before this assembly, let me be allowed in a very few words to say what my views on this very important subject are. Our hearts have been stirred to their depths this year by many circumstances showing a desire in Christian minds for more and truer union with one another in their redeeming Lord. We have had brought before us from many different quarters and in many different forms reference to His consecration prayer to the Holy Father, praying that His disciples might be one, even as He was one with His Father, in the union of the undivided Trinity. And then when we turn from that holy vision, and see not only the division and separation of our own time, but recall words spoken by the Apostles concerning separation, such as these, "Mark them which cause divisions, and avoid them," our hearts fail and our hands hang down. The attitude which I have always felt it my duty to adopt towards our Nonconformist friends, looking at them as Nonconformists, is to meet them on philanthropic, social, literary, and artistic subjects, and all that is best in the secular world; but when it has come to a matter of religion, I have, I confess, felt that I have had great difficulty in passing over the Apostolic veto; and yet, although that has been the case, my heart has always yearned towards them. I have felt that one could not speak too kindly to them, for their Nonconformity has been in many cases not a thing of their own making. I have felt also that the Church of England is bound to take much blame to herself for the position in which we find ourselves. I came this week from the far west of Wales; from a district where there are two parish churches. I had the privilege to minister in one, which has a population of two hundred, and certainly every adult that could be got into the church was there. You might naturally expect that an English preacher going there had drawn that large congregation; but that was not the case. The congregation that I addressed was the ordinary congregation of the church, which is crammed from end to end. Now, it so happens that the vicar of that parish is also vicar of the adjoining parish, with something like the same population, and so far as he can make out the surroundings are much the same; but when I was talking to him the other day, for some reason or other—I was struck with the fact—on Sunday morning—and it was the feast of S. Michael and All Angels—there happened to have been no early celebration. I knew he was a very hard-worked man, and I said to him, "It does seem a little strange to English clergymen that there should not be an early celebration in one of these two churches always. I would willingly have helped you with the English one, where I can speak the language of the people." He said, "My difficulties are very great, and there are some that you cannot understand; but with regard to this other parish, may I say that if I had had a celebration on the morning of Michaelmas, I should have had three people present at it; that is, one

person besides the parish clerk and myself." I said, "How do you account for that?" He said, "It is easily enough accounted for. The fact is that for sixty years—before the appointment of my predecessor, who was here but for a very short time, there being no person in the parish except the clergyman who knew a word of English—the services were held in English, and English only." Well, I say, can we wonder at Nonconformity under circumstances like that. Must we not be glad that there was anyone there to take up the cause of God, and to do the work of Christ among the people. And so I say it is no business of mine or of ours to throw blame broadcast upon those who differ from us, until we know and have studied very carefully the special circumstances which have made them differ. Although it is impossible for me, and for those who think with me, to join in worship with those persons whom we love and still regard as brother Christians, we will not prevent, we will not check, the aspirations of our prayers rising to the throne of grace, and aiming perpetually at this, that they may be, according to the Lord's petition, one with us, even as Christ our Lord is one with His Holy Father.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

WE have had, I think you will all agree with me, a very interesting and instructive debate on the subject of possible union with Nonconformity, and various practical suggestions have been made which are in the power of any of us to carry out. For example, we have been reminded that we may on many occasions make explanations of the doctrines of the Church of England. We all know that it is an undoubted fact that the doctrines of our Church are often grievously misapprehended by Nonconformists as a body. We have also had a hint, and a very useful hint it is, that we ought always, as Christian men, to be careful and show personal kindness and consideration towards those who differ from us. Though we may differ in very important matters, we yet can show brotherly kindness and brotherly love. We have also been reminded that we should, perhaps more than we have done in times past, show our appreciation of the manifold good works that have been performed by Nonconformists. That is a very important point. Those who live in East Anglia cannot but feel that we are bound to recognize the blessed work for Christ which has been done in many instances for our rural parishes—perhaps at a time when the Church has neglected her duty—by Nonconformists. There is one point which has not been touched upon, to my surprise; and that is, how far we may go in association with our Dissenting friends, in the promotion of objects which are common to us all, more especially in regard to moral matters. We have learnt a good deal in that respect during the last few years. We have learnt how to work with our Nonconformist brethren in the promotion of the sacred cause of temperance. We are glad and thankful to be able to stand on the same platform with Nonconformists in advancing the sacred cause of morality. Those are some of the points which have been touched upon, and I hope they will be taken to heart by those who hear me; and I trust that we shall think of them in our prayers, and more especially pray to God that all hindrances to union may be removed, and that there may be ere long, not only union of spirit, but a visible external unity according to the Divine will.

PAPERS.

IN RELATION TO THE CHURCH OF ROME.

The Right Rev. E. A. KNOX, D.D., Bishop Suffragan of Coventry.

THERE is an element of encouragement in the fact that our subject is "The Hindrances to Christian Unity." We are encouraged to hope that the subject of Christian unity is something more than a mere aspiration, that the wish is felt to pass from theory to practice, and that we have begun to ask ourselves why that which has long been regarded as desirable should not be achieved? "It ought to be," is the language of the dreamer. "Why should it not be?" is the language of the man of action.

What, then, are the hindrances to Christian unity as between ourselves and the Church of Rome?

Our answer will be governed, first of all, by our conception of unity. It would be an act of flagrant disloyalty to this Church Congress to suppose that any other unity than a unity of *Churches* is intended. Our subject this afternoon is not "Why should *I* not join the Church of Rome?" or, "Why should any individual Romanist not join the Church of England?" We are not here to treat of the re-admission of any number of units, not even of the aggregate of units in either Church, as *units* into the other Church. But we have to do with the far more difficult question, "What is there to hinder the Church of England, as a *Church*, from being united to the Church of Rome?"

Our subject is not the hindrances to conversion of individuals, but the hindrances to unity of Churches.

Again, the fact that we are to discuss *hindrances* to unity sets aside such unity as already exists. We have, it is true, an acknowledged common heritage with Rome of creed, of government, of discipline, and of practice. We have a large common heritage of prayers, hymns, and works of devotion. We have each a sincere mutual respect for all that is to be found in the other of saintliness of life, and of zeal for the glory of God. If these things are not insisted upon now, it is because our subject implies that the unity of which we speak has not yet been achieved, but is to be sought. The same consideration puts on one side all unity which is no more than co-operation in good works, such as temperance, almsgiving, and the like. The unity which we seek, whatever it is, must be something from which we are at present hindered.

First and foremost among all obstacles to closer unity is the absence of a sufficient desire for unity—I fear we must say on both sides. We must not be deceived by names. We do not always understand what we really want, and so our nominal wishes remain unfulfilled. There are many motives which may call forth the expression of a desire for unity, when some other end is the real object. The wish for the triumph of our own convictions, the wish to be thought charitable, indifferentism, even pure sloth, may all assume so as to deceive even ourselves, the respectable cloak of the desire for unity. The surest mark of an effective desire for unity will be the general cultivation of Love as defined in 1 Cor. xiii.—love, not only in its kindliness of heart, but in its humility and its firm conviction that "now we see in a glass darkly, now we know in part"; that our present knowledge is but partial, and a cause for humiliation rather than self-congratulation. In proportion as love prevails through Christendom, in the same proportion will the first great obstacle to unity be removed.

Beyond this moral obstacle lies the difficulty of agreement as to the form of unity which is really desirable. Perilous are the consequences of a false ideal. What but a false ideal destroyed the Jewish Church? Upon the basis of prophecies promising to the house of David a dominion extending to the world's end was built up that Messianic expectation which led to the acceptance of Cæsar and rejection of our blessed Lord as king of Israel. Or, to come still nearer home—upon the lofty conception of a Church possessing the two swords of civil and ecclesiastical power was built up the dream which wrecked the unity of Latin Christendom.

We are apt to assume that the prayer of our blessed Lord for the unity of the Church is obviously intelligible; but when we ponder the words, "that they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us," are we not in the presence of a great mystery? There is doubtless more in this prayer than we have ever grasped. The unity spoken of is far more than a mere moral unity of purpose, feeling, and affection; it is in some mysterious mode a vital unity. Perhaps the chief source of Church division has been the attempt to realise forcibly, by unity of external mould, that which was to have been a unity of growth. It is true that the Church begins from "one faith" as the foundation of her existence, but it is also true that "the unity of the faith" is the consummation of her plan, and we may by our haste confuse, instead of forward, the unity for which our Master prayed.

It remains that we should examine the hindrances to such ideals of unity as have been proposed, or rather let me say such as have come under my notice, which for the sake of convenience I will call the ideals of unity of federation, unity of friendliness, and unity of faith. Of these I will deal first with the idea of *Unity of Federation.* It has been suggested that since we are at one with the Church of Rome on many points of faith and on the necessity of Episcopal government, each Church might agree to recognize the other as a true Church, while each retained its own form of faith and government. This idea practically is tantamount to a desire that the Roman Church should acknowledge the truth of the notion of one visible Church, with three branches, Greek, Latin, and Anglican. Of course the Roman conception of the Church leaves no room for such a notion. Rome has always held that *the Church* can be but one. The idea of one Church in three branches is modern; not older, so far as I know, than the seventeenth century. Further, we are informed by those who claim to know the mind of the Roman authorities upon this subject, that they expressly exclude any "federation of independent Churches professing divergent creeds" from the sphere of sincere efforts after reunion. Setting aside, therefore, the ordinary difficulties attaching to federation of independent powers in the political world—and in the religious world, these difficulties must of necessity be increased, not diminished—we may be certain that neither Rome, nor those among us who are most eager for Roman reunion, would accept the idea of federation. They would not even look upon it as a step in the right direction. It is impossible to say, where all schemes are remote of accomplishment, that federal unity is out of the question, but it is so one-sided in the concession which it demands of Rome, that it is little short of conversion of the Church of Rome on the point which she considers most essential of all. If Rome conceded this, there is little else that she might not be expected to concede.

There is next the *Unity of Friendliness*, which appears to be a possible practical outcome of the recognition of our Orders by the Church of Rome. Whether it has been wise to press for such recognition, and what may be the effect of an adverse decision upon some minds, is another question; but there are those who disbelieve in the possibility of unity of faith, and yet desire earnestly a unity of friendliness or

inter-communion: that it should be possible for members of either Church, without suspicion of disloyalty to their own society, to communicate with the other, and to hold the freest social intercourse. While Rome treats even our baptism as doubtful, such friendly intercourse is out of the question.

My business this afternoon is not to discuss the possibility or advantages of unity, but the obstacles to it. The chief obstacle to this plan, besides the barrier of our Orders, is the danger of seeming to treat with indifference such crucial points as Mariolatry, image-worship, and transubstantiation. The unlearned and indifferent are only too ready to assume that all creeds are equally true or equally false, and to suspect us of holding the same opinion, at least in secret. We desire unity, but they desire undenominationalism. No doubt the unity of friendliness is attractive to men of broad sympathy and intellectual culture, who could practise it without receiving injury from it. It is attractive also to those who differ from Rome chiefly on the question of Papal jurisdiction. But if the errors of Rome are as serious as our Articles represent them to be, and as Rome believes them to be (else why is our excommunication not removed?), authorised intercommunion could not fail to be open to misconstruction. It is the attitude of the two Churches, not of individuals on either side, that we must consider.

I pass on to the *Unity of Faith*, under which may be included unity of doctrine, discipline, government, and practice. To some of us this unity perhaps appears not only attainable, but already well-nigh attained, and the distinctions which divide us from Rome so few as hardly to justify the sin of separation. To others there is the same great gulf fixed as of old, only yawning wider on account of fresh dogmas added since the Reformation. My object will be to fix your attention, not so much on particular doctrines as on the principles which underlie them, for, if we enumerate doctrines we are likely to be led aside into an unedifying display of the differences within our own fold.

(1) Now the first of these principles is one which is at the root of all the rest. Rome rests on her faith in the infallibility of the Roman Church, or, as she would prefer to say, the visible Church of Christ. The Church of England, as Canon Gore has recently said, is "committed irretrievably to an appeal to Scripture," and from Scripture we conclude that the Roman Church has erred, and that even the General Councils of the Church are not infallible. For my own part I cannot condemn those Romanists who, like Cardinal Vaughan, make the acknowledgment of papal infallibility an indispensable preliminary to any scheme of reunion. From the Roman point of view it is indispensable, and the fact that Rome rests on this assumption is a principal obstacle to any other unity but that of re-conversion. If there ever should be any modification of the Roman position, it will probably result from the progress of Biblical study among her theologians, and the spread of Bible-reading among the Roman laity. Modern Biblical criticism will probably yield fruit very different from that which has been expected on one side and feared on the other. Our divisions have grown out of diverse interpretations of the Bible, of which Protestants as well as Romanists have sometimes assumed too hastily that they had reached the final and full meaning. And it is in the

Bible that we shall find, if anywhere, our reconciliation. *Hic est, aut nusquam, quod quærimus.*

(2) *As to Church Government.* The great obstacle here is our denial of papal jurisdiction, and our acknowledgment of the royal supremacy. How Rome may come to learn, as we have learnt, the rights of national Churches and the rights of the laity within the Church we cannot tell. But certain it is that in time she must unlearn the Imperial and Italian traditions, which are at once her weakness and her strength. Even the future continuance of the papacy in Rome is by no means assured. Who can foresee the changes which must result, when Roman claims are transferred to a new home in Ireland or America, or even in England? Time is on our side, and on the side of reunion. In this matter of Church government our strength is to sit still.

(3) *As to discipline.* Rome rests on the system of compulsory confession, with its attendant penances and indulgences: our Church invites her members to seek further aid only when they cannot quiet their consciences by direct personal dealing with God. The reconciliation, if ever it is found, will probably lie in the direction of a fuller recognition than any Church has yet made of the "diversity of gifts." The gift of quieting and guiding the conscience is a distinct gift, and is often found outside the ranks of the ordained ministry, and by no means always within those ranks. We have, both the Roman Church and our own, to learn how to combine the authority given to the Church with the exercise of it by those who have the distinct gift of the Spirit, and, further, how the exercise of the disciplinary power of the Church is to be harmonized with the immediate and absolute responsibility of each soul to God.

(4) *As to practice.* Under this head we are told that Rome is willing to make large concessions. No doubt we, on our side, would concede much for the sake of unity. Yet when we come to specific details, it will be very clear what need there is of time and patience. Rome, for instance, still holds fast to the celibacy of her clergy, and regards marriage of the clergy as little short of sacrilege. We maintain that our practice is more Scriptural and full of benefit to the whole Church. Rome practises, we repudiate, image-worship and invocation of saints. Rome insists on uniformity of ritual, we have drifted into very wide diversity. These are only a few instances out of many, in which neither Church can justly make a concession outright even for the sake of unity, since in such cases practice implies wide divergence of principle. We must wait, and once more believe that time is on the side of unity.

But if the time is not yet come for reunion, what can we do in the interval in that direction? There is one thing which we must not do. We must not give away the cause of the reunion of Christendom for the sake of reunion with Rome. We must not mislead Rome by servile imitation, nor make her more unyielding by inspiring her with false hopes of a complete surrender. We must not suppose that every step Romeward is a step forward, nor assume that Rome was always in the right, and our Reformers in the wrong. God has given us a noble heritage of Primitive use and Primitive teaching, which may yet be the meeting point, not only for Rome, but for Eastern Christendom, for Nonconformists, and for the Churches which are being drawn out of the heathen and Mohammedan world. There is nothing in Rome which

can satisfy all these needs. *Parcere devictis et debellare superbos* has been far too consistently her watchword. The reunion for which we look is not a reunion of defect, but a reunion of love, of growth, of holiness, of personal adhesion to a living Saviour. Just as the Roman world grew too vast for the traditions of the empire, so the Church has grown too vast for the kindred traditions of the papacy. Still, as the Church becomes more Catholic, she is becoming less Roman.

To the question, "How shall we employ the interval?" let our answer rather be this: "Let us follow up more closely than ever the method of prayer and of Scriptural research and Scriptural study. *Hic est, aut nusquam, quod quærimus.* Let us learn more perfectly the whole groundwork of our own Book of Common Prayer, on which most of our text-books are miserably meagre and inadequate, and the full history of which is yet to be written. Let us cultivate the spirit of teachableness, and be very careful how we settle it in our minds that those who disagree with us are offenders either against Scriptural or against Catholic truth. Above all, let us have faith in God, Whose work is not measured by time. Of our divisions it may be true for the present, as it was true of the divisions of Israel, "this thing is of God." But if we are sincere in our desire for unity, He will bring us, by the way of prayer, of love, and of scriptural and liturgical study, nearer at least to the final goal, "when we shall all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God."

---

(3) In relation to the Churches of the East.

The Rev. Frederick Meyrick, Vicar of Blickling, Norfolk, and Prebendary of Lincoln.

Reunion with the Oriental Church is not so impracticable as with the Church of Rome; for the Oriental Church has no papacy, no one bishop to be recognized as the monarch of the Church Universal, exercising a jurisdiction in all parts of the same by his deputies, infallible in all matters of doctrine and morals, the living representative of Christ on earth. This obstacle, which makes all conditions and all terms of union so much waste paper, which the infallible party to the bargain may concede if he will and break when he will, does not exist in the Oriental Church. Nor, again, are there so many specific subjects of difference between ourselves and the East as between us and the Latin Church. The Orientals have no creed of Pope Pius IV. to enforce,* containing a summary of those doctrines by which the Roman differs from the Catholic faith, nor the supplement to that creed made in our own day by Pope Pius IX., comprising those dogmas which have been created since the time of the Council of Trent. It was found at the conference of Bonn that representatives of the Oriental Church were at one with Anglicans and Old Catholics in opposition to Rome on such burning questions as the canon of Holy Scripture, the liberty and duty of reading Holy Scripture, the use of a language understood by the people, justification, free grace and human merit, works of supererogation, merits of the saints, the number of the sacraments, tradition, the immaculate conception, confession, indulgences, commemoration of the

* The Articles of the Council of Bethlehem, held in 1672, form the nearest approach in the Eastern Church to the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

faithful departed, the nature of the Holy Eucharist, purgatory, papal infallibility, the procession of the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, the hindrances to full union and communion with the Oriental Church are very grave and very real. And some of the gravest are not those which lie on the surface.

(1) That which first presents itself is the single or double procession of the Holy Ghost. What is this doctrine, which has played so great a part in the schism of the East and West, and how did it come to be such a bone of contention? That which lies at the bottom of it is the question whether the Holy Ghost takes His nature in eternity from the Father and the Son, or from the Father alone. The Eastern Church, resting on the exact words of Scripture, and very jealous for the unity of the Godhead, holds that He proceeds from the Father alone. The Western Church, considering that the words of Scripture imply the double procession, and denying that the doctrine of the unity of the Godhead is thereby endangered, holds that He proceeds from the Father and the Son. The difference would never have caused, or been the excuse for, a schism, had it not been for historical events which gave a factitious importance to the question. For when the Council of Constantinople added the latter clauses to that which we know as the Nicene Creed, it used the scriptural expression, "Who proceedeth from the Father," and this form was thus stamped with the authority of the Universal Church. Two hundred years later, a local council held at Toledo, at the instance of King Reccared and Bishop Leander, in reciting the Creed introduced the words "and the Son," and that form was, after many years' opposition, accepted by the whole of the West, though unauthorized by an Œcumenical Council.* Even yet the matter had not passed the stage where reconciliation was possible; but soon there sprang up the papal claims in the West, and the resolute determination to resist them in the East, which took away the desire of coming to an agreement. At the Conference of Bonn, in 1875, a formula was found which both Western Churchmen, represented by Anglicans and Old Catholics, and Eastern Churchmen, representing the Churches of Greece proper, Constantinople, and Russia, could accept; which was declared by a committee of the Convocation of Canterbury to be satisfactory. I do not doubt that the point of doctrine may be adjusted on the terms of *our* removing the words "and the Son" from the Nicene Creed, on the ground of their having been introduced into an Œcumenical Creed without adequate authority; and of *the Orientals* declaring themselves contented with that concession, without requiring us to condemn the doctrine of the double procession, any more than we require them to condemn the doctrine of the single procession. This difference, then, may be adjusted, provided that it be taken in hand with the hearty good will which was exhibited at the Conference of Bonn.

(2) I will next mention the Oriental doctrine of the Holy Communion. The Orientals do not hold transubstantiation; but they do hold a doctrine similar to consubstantiation. A formula was found at Bonn which Orientals, Old Catholics, and Anglicans could accept, and I will pass by this point, only saying that it is a difficulty which may be adjusted.

* See "History of the Church of Spain," in the "National Churches" Series, p. 154 (Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.)

(3) The adoration of saints and of icons or sacred pictures presents graver difficulties. The practice of icon worship is so universal and so extravagant, and the doctrine of saint worship is so fully sanctioned by recognized books of devotion, that we cannot but regard this as a great blot on the orthodoxy of the Eastern Church. Yet, as it is the acknowledged principle of that Church to appeal to Holy Scripture and to antiquity, we may well hope that with increasing enlightenment—for the majority of its priests and members, not wholly by their own fault, are very ignorant—with the discovery that in Holy Scripture there is nothing to support and everything to condemn the practices, that in the primitive Church, at least down to the sixth century, no such practices were known, except to be denounced as a part of heathendom, we may well hope, I say, that saint worship and icon worship, which in the Latin Church the Easterns already denounce, they may themselves either abandon or so modify as to make them comparatively harmless. This hope would rise to an expectation, were it not that the theological doctrine is mixed up with an ecclesiastical question, which creates a difficulty harder to overcome than any dogma of the faith. For

(4) The acceptance or non-acceptance of the Second Council of Nicæa as an Œcumenical Council is not a matter which admits of compromise, or can be affected by any speculative distinctions or interpretations of words. An explanation of the word "proceeding" and of "worship" may go far towards removing the difference between the Oriental and the Anglican views of the procession, and of saint and icon worship, when there is good will on both sides. But the Second Council of Nicæa either is, or is not, an Œcumenical Council of the Church, carrying with it for its decrees the authority of the Church Catholic. The Oriental Church passionately affirms that it is, holding, in spite of evidence, that Christian doctrine continued uncorrupted and unchanged for the first eight hundred years, and that the Œcumenical Councils are the infallible expositors of that doctrine, and that the Œcumenical Councils are seven in number, the last of them being the Second Council of Nicæa. English Churchmen, on the other hand, are unable to recognize the notes of an Œcumenical Council in the Second Council of Nicæa. It was not properly summoned, for the Western bishops were not invited, nor even the Eastern bishops, with the exception of those that belonged to the "diœcese" or patriarchate of Constantinople. Its deliberations were not free. Idle stories were substituted for arguments. Its conclusions, like those of Constance, were plainly contrary to Scripture. Its decisions were rejected, as soon as heard, by the Church at large in the Council of Frankfort and elsewhere. In short, we regard it as a discredited synod of the Byzantine "diœcese," having no greater claim to be Œcumenical than the Council of Constantinople held thirty-three years before, A.D. 754, which professed, like Nicæa II., to be Œcumenical, and came to opposite conclusions on almost all points. English Churchmen can never accept the Second Council of Nicæa as Œcumenical, nor its decrees sanctioning saint and icon worship as binding. That the Eastern Church does accept them is a grave obstacle to the union of the two Churches, the removal of which must be left to God.

(5) There is yet another hindrance which does not appear on the surface, but which grows more and more formidable to our apprehensions

the closer we are brought together. This is the Eastern doctrine of the infallibility of the Church. The Eastern Churchman holds that God made His revelation to his Church, and that that revelation is contained in Holy Scripture, and expounded by the Seven Œcumenical Councils. So far, we should have no quarrel with him, except with respect to the so-called Seventh Council. But he is not content with this. He is not satisfied with arguing *a posteriori* that the expositions of the Faith by the genuine Councils *are* infallibly, or quite certainly, true, but he maintains *a priori* that they must have been so, owing to a gift of infallibility existing in the Church, and finding expression in its mouthpieces the Œcumenical Councils. Nor is this all; for he holds that this gift of infallibility does not depend on the unity of Christendom, that it did not, therefore, fall into abeyance at the disruption of East and West, that it exists still. But where does it exist? Not, certainly, in the Latin Church, which the Oriental Church has formally denounced as the apostacy of the latter days; not in the Old Catholics or Anglicans, whom it regards as holding much orthodox doctrine, but mixed with error; still less in the Lutherans and Calvinists, or Eastern schismatical communions. There remains only the Orthodox communion, which alone is supposed to preserve the traditions and the powers of the Church of the first eight centuries. This communion consists of the local Churches of Constantinople, Russia, Greece, Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia, Herzegovina, and Montenegro. The representatives of these Churches, therefore, might form a council, which would be equally venerable with the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, the decrees of which would be infallible. Nay, more, that infallibility exists at present in the Church diffusive (thus locally limited to the Oriental Communion), and prevents it from having fallen in the past, or falling in the present or the future, into any dogmatic error whatever.

It is needless to point out what an obstacle the frame of mind thus engendered must present to efforts towards re-union. Other communions may come and rest under the shadow of the Orthodox Church, and may accept orthodoxy from her, but she can make no change—neither in the doctrine of saint worship, nor the practice of icon worship, nor the theory of the Seven Councils, nor anything else. She is already the ideal Church; she cannot change herself, and she cannot accept other Churches to her communion except on the condition of their conforming to her model. How is this difficulty to be overcome? I know not, except by the Oriental Church becoming taught of God that infallibility is to be found in His revelation to men, not in the men for whom that revelation has been made.

Here, then, are the hindrances on the side of the Oriental Church to the union of the two Churches, some less, some more readily admitting of adjustment: (1) The doctrine of the procession; (2) the doctrine of the Eucharist; (3) the doctrine and practice of saint and icon worship; (4) the tenet of the Œcumenical character of the Second Council of Nicæa; (5) the doctrine of the infallibility of the universal Church, which, in respect to its infallibility, is, owing to the Western schism, confined to the Eastern Church.

These, I say, are the hindrances on the side of the Oriental Church. We must not forget that there are hindrances on our side also. They

arise chiefly from the contented ignorance of the Eastern Church, its claims and excellencies, in which we allow ourselves to continue. The massive bulk of the Latin Church intercepts our view, and those who do look beyond the four seas too often look no further than Western Europe, Africa, and America. If we would look eastwards, we might find much which, in spite of hindrances, might give us hope.

That which is most hopeful is perhaps the temper of mind of the Eastern Church, so different from that of the Church of Rome. Travelling in countries where the Latin Church holds sway, we feel that we are in the land of strangers and antagonists, whose love for us is that of Henry V. for France, who "would not part with a village of it, but have it all as his own" (Henry V. 5, 2), whereas in Eastern lands Churchmen are sorry for separation from unselfish motive, and are our brethren in heart, any theories, dogmas, or hindrances notwithstanding. And so they gladly do acts of Christian courtesy and charity. such as burying our dead when no Anglican clergy are to be found; such as placing our clergy by the side of their own in ecclesiastical functions; such as granting, as the good Patriarch of Jerusalem granted to Dr. Hale, and again to Canon Liddon, and subsequently, the chapel of S. Abraham in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to celebrate the Easter Eucharist after the Anglican Rite; such as petitioning the Archbishop of Canterbury to place a Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem, to promote "a nearer intercourse between the two Churches," and welcoming the Bishop's presence in the Holy City, as the Patriarch welcomes him. These acts of Christian kindness are not lost upon us.

Again, we may see the temper of the Oriental Church in the way in which it has dealt with the Old Catholic question. While no Roman ecclesiastic could or might attend at the Conference of Bonn or the various Old Catholic Congresses, there have been always present archbishops, archpriests, archimandrites, and other representatives of the Oriental Church, who, while maintaining their own doctrines, as was right they should do, joined as brothers with Old Catholics and Anglicans in Döllinger's great attempt to form a union of all non-vaticanized and faithful Christians under the headship of Christ alone, and in antagonism to the false unity of Rome. At those meetings Anglicans have been in the habit of associating with representatives of the great Russian Church, specially General Kiréeff and Archpriest Janyscheff, who have shown the most earnest desire to apprehend and understand the position of Western Churchmen; and one of these, Archpriest Janyscheff, being the chief ecclesiastic in the Emperor's household, had the duty of preparing the present Tzarina for admission into the National Communion. The fact (if it be a fact) that in passing from one National Church to the other she declined to condemn the Church that she was leaving, is an omen full of the most happy auguries for the future.

In conclusion, I will say that mutual acquaintanceship and respect may solve difficulties which no controversy could remove.

S. ANDREW'S HALL.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 10TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

HINDRANCES TO CHRISTIAN UNITY—(*continued*).

(1) IN RELATION TO NONCONFORMITY.
(2) IN RELATION TO THE CHURCH OF ROME.
(3) IN RELATION TO THE CHURCHES OF THE EAST.

PAPER.

(3) IN RELATION TO THE CHURCHES OF THE EAST.

WILLIAM JOHN BIRKBECK, Esq., Thorpe S. Andrew.

HOWEVER important the other portions of the Orthodox Eastern Church may be, it is with the Church of Russia that the question of reunion with the East chiefly rests. That greatest and most important of all national Churches, with her little short of eighty million members, comprising almost four-fifths of the numbers, and at least nine-tenths of the learning of the whole Orthodox communion, and which, originating in a single bishopric, planted from Constantinople at Kieff in the tenth century, now extends from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea, and from the Baltic to the waves of the Pacific, can never be a negligible quantity in questions of Christian unity. Moreover, there is no Church in the world with a better title to the intelligent and sympathetic investigation of English Churchmen. Her firm and never-varying hold on Catholic truth, her enormous influence for good upon the teeming masses over which her jurisdiction extends, and the energy and success of her missions to the heathen and Mohammedans within her own sphere of action, stand without a rival in Christendom; while in the ability and learning of her theologians she is quite able to hold her own with even the most learned of Western communities. If this is not generally acknowledged in the West, it is, as Professor Harnack has pointed out, owing to the fact that they write in a language not often known by Western theologians. In a review of a work upon Theodoret of Cyrrha, written as an exercise for his master's degree by Nicholas Glubokoffski, a student in the Academy in the Troitza Monastery, near Moscow, Dr. Harnack says that that Academy has here produced the most able patristic monograph which has been given to the world since Lightfoot's "Ignatius."* And this is by no means a singular instance.

It is, then, to Russian theology that I am going to devote myself to-day.

It is not always realized, but it is nevertheless a fact, that the Eastern Church, no less than the Roman Church and the various Protestant bodies, possesses a school of theology of its own, which, owing to the fact that it is separated from us by a thousand, instead of only three hundred years of history, it is at first extremely hard for us to understand. The first hindrance we have to overcome is the difficulty of exactly

* *Theologische Literaturzeitung.* Herausgeg. von Dr. Ad. Harnack. No. 20, Oct. 4, 1890.

grasping her theological position. When an Anglican first begins discussing matters with Easterns, he is every moment confronted with surprises and enigmas of the most unexpected kind. He finds himself constantly talking at cross-purposes, and is not seldom repelled by what seems to him to be a needless making of mole-hills into mountains. These show themselves even in questions of mere ceremonial. The first religious discussion I ever had in Russia was with a monk at Kieff, not a very learned man, but, as most of the Kieff clergy are, extremely well up in the Roman controversy. Amongst other things he suddenly asked me "Do you always use incense in your churches?" I, forgetting for the moment that in the Eastern Church no service is without incense, and not knowing of the serious troubles which have occurred in the Uniat Ruthenian body with regard to this, but thinking that he had heard something about our Ornaments Rubric, replied, "No, not always, only sometimes." To my astonishment he answered, "Did I not tell you that yours is a Popish Church? For you know that it was the Papists who invented low masses with no music or incense, and that just about the time when they were inventing their new clause *Filioque* for the creed." I quote this as an example, not of a serious hindrance to unity, nor of theological learning, but of the sort of misunderstanding which constantly arises in the East from discussing matters from totally different points of view. Perhaps, then, it will be said, "Why not try the common ground of antagonism to Rome?" Let us see the results. Your Eastern begins: "Does your Church withhold the chalice from the laity as the Latins do?" "Certainly not; we remedied this at the Reformation." "Thank God for that," replies the Eastern, "but why, then, don't you also restore to infants Confirmation and Holy Communion, which the West has deprived them of?" To this I have always found great difficulty in replying. Any answer which an Eastern will even listen to tells equally against infant baptism, and if you object that an unconscious infant is incapable of the faith needful in order to benefit by the Sacraments, he will answer that, like the Papists, you are confounding faith with reason, and will remind you that, if S. John Baptist, even before his birth, could rejoice concerning Christ, human wisdom is evidently not a fit judge as to the age at which a child can discern Him in His sacraments.*

This last sentence will give us the key to the whole difference between East and West. The East look upon the whole of the West as having, together with Rome, left the Church at the great schism consummated in the eleventh century. She never went through our scholastic period, and will have nothing to say to its philosophy or theology. She considers that the West, in insisting upon her view of the points then in dispute, substituted the hypothetical reasoning of a part, for the divinely inspired faith of the whole, of the Church. This is the real point of the controversy concerning *Filioque*. It is not a question as to whether the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father can or cannot be logically proved from Scripture or the writings of the Fathers, but whether a portion of the Church, however large, or an individual within the Church, however exalted, has the right to add or subtract anything to or from the Church's own definition of her faith without the consent of the whole body. The Easterns maintain that the Church

* Khomiakoff, "Essay on the Unity of the Church." See my "Russia and the English Church" (Rivington, Percival & Co.), p. 216.

alone is infallible, and this because, being the body of which Christ is the head, she alone is perfectly holy; for inasmuch as sin separates from the knowledge of God, no individual can claim for himself the fulness of her infallibility, any more than the fulness of her sanctity.* And thus their difference with Rome and with Protestantism is precisely the same; in each case, they say, a new and unknown quantity is introduced —the substitution of the authority of individuals for that of the Church. Indeed Eastern theologians maintain that the one logically follows from the other; for if one individual assumes the right to govern the whole Church, there are sure to be those that will dispute it, and assume that they have a right to judge for themselves. Accordingly a Russian writer says that if the whole matter be put into an algebraical form, this unknown quantity may be represented by the formula a; whether it be a Roman $+ a$, or a Protestant $- a$, makes little difference, the a remains there all the same.†

Now I have put this theory in its baldest form, not because I absolutely agree with it—for even if he be so uncharitable as to wish to do so, no Anglican can admit that at the great schism Rome ceased to be a true part of the one Church without committing ecclesiastical suicide; but because before there can be any talk of unity, we must at least understand the Eastern position. I think that we here agree with them in principle, however much we may differ in its application. It agrees absolutely with the latter part of our Article XIX. on the Church, which points out that individual patriarchates, even if founded by Apostles, not only theoretically may err, but, historically speaking, have erred before now in matters of faith. The fact that this Article causes great offence to Easterns is an illustration of what I began by saying, namely, that Easterns and Anglicans so often argue at cross-purposes; for was not the deposition of a Patriarch of Alexandria, Cyril Lucar, for Calvinistic heresy, less than a century after this Article was drawn up, a practical example of the truth which it asserts, no less than the condemnation of Honorius by the Sixth General Council.‡ Then, again, let us see how this theory affects the question of the consecration of bishops. Some Roman theologians maintain that the principal consecrator alone confers the sacrament; and that he derives his authority to do so from the Pope. The Easterns, on the contrary, maintain, that, inasmuch as, "without contradiction, the less is blessed of the better," so in the manner of orders, a single bishop cannot by himself make another man bishop, it is only the Church which can do so; and that a council of bishops—many or few, does not matter, so long as the Church accepts them as representing her for the purpose—is the proper instrument in conferring the sacrament of orders, just as a council, and not an individual, is the proper exponent of her doctrine. § Again, just as the authority of a General Council

---

* Khomiakoff, "Essay on the Unity of the Church." See my "Russia and the English Church" (Rivington, Percival & Co.) p. 197, 215, &c. † Ibid, p. 67.

‡ That this passage in Article XIX. is not directed against the Eastern Church as a whole, is perfectly clear from the omission of all mention of Constantinople. The argument is that the fact of the Roman See having been founded by the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, did not give their successors immunity from error, any more than the occupants of the other Apostolic Patriarchates. Constantinople is omitted, not because its Patriarchal throne was never occupied by an heretic, for this would of course be notoriously contrary to fact, but because it was not an Apostolic See.

§ Nicolski, "Explanation of the Services of the Church." (St. Petersburg Imperial Press, 1888), p. 671.

depends upon the whole Church, the laity included, accepting its decisions as the teaching of the Church, and as all the General Councils which the East acknowledges were therefore summoned by the Emperor, so both the hierarchy and the laity (the latter in a properly regulated Christian State may be represented by the secular power), should give their assent to a Bishop's consecration in some form or other.* One more point. While all the Bishops together confer the sacrament, by the laying on of their hands, only one of them, and he the highest in rank, speaks the sacramental formula. What is this, as Symeon of Thessalonica suggests,† but S. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, representing not Christ, but the unity of His Church: as when on the day of Pentecost he stood up with the eleven and proclaimed the truth of the Gospel; or when his successor, S. Leo the Great, proclaimed the faith at Chalcedon,‡ and thus constituted in his own person the expression, although not the origin or the source, of the Church's unity? For though the Easterns look upon Rome as at present fallen away, they agree with us in not looking at the present state of things as normal; and I have often heard them say that if Rome would go back to the *status quo ante*, they would gladly recognize her Bishop as the Primate of Christendom.

But to proceed. With regard to three hindrances to unity which are often mentioned, both in England and Russia: namely, the Seventh General Council, Invocation of Saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin, it ought to be remembered that the attitude and practice of the Eastern Church in regard to all three of these are in some respect different to those of any part of Western Christendom, and are indissolubly connected with her teaching with regard to the nature of the Church which we have just been examining. For the unity of the Church does not, from her point of view, consist of a group of individuals agreeing together to differ,§ neither does it consist of a federation of religious communities whose faith on essential points is not identical,‖ neither is it a unity bound together by its external machinery of ecclesiastical government,¶ but it consists of being a living Body of which Christ is the Head, and in which the Holy Spirit dwells. Accordingly, a modern Russian theologian has defined the Church as "Truth and love, in the form of a living organism."** As far as the Church upon earth is concerned, a General Council, when accepted by the Church, is regarded

---

* Khomiakoff, "*L'Eglise latine et le Protestantisme*," pp. 17, 19.

† Sym. Thess., *de sacris Ordinibus*, cap. clxix. It is true that Symeon is here speaking only of the Ordination of a Deacon, but the same thing is implied with regard to the consecration of a Bishop when he speaks (cap. clxxxix.) of the three consecrating Bishops, ordered by the Apostolic Canon, as representing SS. Peter, James, and John, while (cap. ccvi.) the book of the Gospels placed on the head of the Ordinand represents Christ, and, through Him, His Church.

‡ See several verses in the Canon by Theophanes still used by the Eastern Church on the Feast of S. Leo. (Feb. 18).

§ Khomiakoff amusingly describes the German Protestant's conception of the Church as "a society of good men differing in all their opinions, but earnestly seeking for truth, with a total certainty that it has not yet been found, and with no hope at all ever to find it." "Russia and the English Church," p. 40.

‖ S. John Damasc. "*De fide Orthodoxâ*," i. 8, σύνθεσις γαρ ἀρχὴ διαστάσεως. See also Khomiakoff, "Russia and the English Church," p. 194.

¶ Khomiakoff, "*L'Eglise latine et le Protestantisme*," p. 36, and many other places.

** Samarin, Introduction to Khomiakoff's theological works, Khomiakoff's works, vol. ii., p. 21.

as a final exponent of the truth ; while her love finds expression in her worship and in the communion of all her members in prayer.* I should have liked to have gone into both these points, but owing to limitation of time, I must confine myself to-day to the first.

Both Easterns and Anglicans recognize the authority of the undisputed General Councils. But whereas the Easterns acknowledge seven, many Anglican theologians acknowledge only six, and maintain that as the Seventh General Council was rejected by the Council of Frankfurt, at which the English Church was represented in the form of a letter written to Charlemagne, we never accepted it. But this plea will only satisfy those who have not read the texts of both councils. The Easterns know all about the Council of Frankfurt, and will instantly point out, not only that we afterwards, without protest, accepted the Seventh Council with the rest of the West, but that what was rejected at Frankfurt was not the *τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις*, or relative "worship of honour" and respect to all sacred things and persons which the second Council of Nicæa sanctioned, but *imaginibus ita ut deificae Trinitati servitium aut adorationem impendere*, namely, that absolute service and adoration which is offered to the Triune Deity alone, and which, under the term *λατρεία*, the Second Council of Nicæa also condemns.† I may say in

* The Eas ern theologians, following S. John Chrysostom (In Epist. ad Ephes. cap. iv. Homil. x. 1), point out that the members of the Church, living, departed, and those as yet unborn, form one body, the body of Christ, relatively to man, indeed, fulfilling itself in time, but, in the sight of God, already existing in its completeness ; its breath is the Holy Spirit of Christ, while the mutual intercession in Christ of individuals, every one of which is needed by the others, is its life blood coursing through its members, and quickening its being. One of the most solemn thoughts with which I have met amongst Orthodox Easterns is, that not only is each one of us assisted by the prayers of the blessed Virgin and all the saints, but that they were assisted by the prayers, foreknown to God, of every member of the Church that has lived or ever will live upon earth. And thus, not only will they say of S. Mary, *σὺ γὰρ εἶ ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ γένους τῶν Χριστιανῶν*, which is the same thing as Irenæus, "*obediens, et sibi, et universo generi humano causa facta est salutis*," but that when she answered, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord," and accordingly became the Mother of God, she was being aided by every member of the Church who ever has said, or will say, "Thy kingdom come." The Eastern invocation of saints neither in theory nor in practice differs in kind from requests for intercession addressed to, and prayers offered for, individuals still living upon earth. I will give two illustrations of this. At the end of the Eastern offices of Tierce and Sext, at an ordinary service the priest prays that their requests may be granted "through the prayers of our holy fathers," but if the bishop be present, this is changed into "through the prayers of our Lord Bishop, N." Again, once when I was travelling with a poor student in the north of Russia, we came to where his mother was buried, and, as is the custom, he had a small service performed by the grave for the repose of her soul. That night when he was saying his evening prayers in a post house where we were sleeping, I heard him *asking* his mother, along with S. Mary and the other saints whom he addressed, to help him with her prayers. This combination of prayers for and to the departed is extremely like some of the inscriptions in the Catacombs, dating from the third century onwards.

† The following was the decree of the Second Council of Nicæa (Labbe, t. xiii., p. 377) :—

ὁρίζομεν σὺν ἀκριβείᾳ πάσῃ καὶ ἐμμελείᾳ παραπλησίως τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ ἀνατίθεσθαι τὰς σεπτὰς καὶ ἁγίας εἰκόνας . . . ὅσῳ συνεχῶς δι' εἰκονικῆς ἀνατυπώσεως ὁρῶνται, τοσοῦτον καὶ οἱ ταύτας θεώμενοι διανίστανται πρὸς τὴν τῶν πρωτοτύπων μνήμην τε καὶ ἐπιπόθησιν, καὶ ταύταις ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονέμειν, οὐ μὴν τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν

passing that modern Russian theologians do not consider the scholastic term *dulia* as a proper definition of the relations which ought to exist between us and the saints, for they say that we are not their slaves, but their brethren, the children of one common Father ; * and *a fortiori* they, of course, reject it with regard to images. As far as the actual veneration of icons in the East is concerned, it is not of the nature which, to eyes unaccustomed to it, it appears to be. When an Eastern asks me my views on the subject, I always, as a Norfolk man, quote the quaint saying of Sir Thomas Browne, of Norwich, who declared that "at the sight of a cross or crucifix he could dispense with his hat, but scarce with the thought or memory of his Saviour." † And every Eastern theologian will tell you that this is all that the Seventh General Council means. It must be remembered that the Seventh General Council does not condemn those who do not themselves use such outward forms, but only those who declare such as do to be idolaters,‡ a principle which, in the interests of reunion, might well be applied to other matters. It was dealing with an exclusively Eastern controversy, the true bearings of which are rather difficult for the Western mind to grasp, and of which the council of Frankfurt plainly knew nothing. Under a praiseworthy but mistaken zeal for purity of worship, iconoclasm unconsciously concealed a very subtle heresy, in which the reality of our Lord's Incarnation was involved. Even previous to the Incarnation, imagery in language had been allowed in order to express truths concerning the infinite Deity, otherwise beyond the comprehension of the finite mind of man. Thus the holy Prophets and Psalmists constantly speak of "the hand" or "the arm" of God, and use many similar expressions, which, unless taken as images in language, are in fact incorrect, and even blasphemous.§ Therefore it was dangerous to represent these expressions in a permanent form, for they were then liable to lead to false ideas of the Deity, or even to idolatry ; and hence the Jewish law condemned the making of painted or graven images of God, on the express ground that the people of Israel "has seen no similitude in the Mount." And this, in view of abuses which had crept in with regard to the use of sacred pictures, was what the Iconoclasts wished to re-inforce in the Christian Church. The Orthodox, however, led by S. John Damascene, pointed

---

ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, ἣ πρέπει μόνῃ τῇ θείᾳ φύσει, ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις εὐαγγελίοις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναθήμασι, καὶ θυμιαμάτων καὶ φώτων προσαγωγὴν πρὸς τὴν τούτων τιμὴν ποιεῖσθαι, καθὼς καὶ τοῖς ἀρχαιόις εὐσεβῶς εἴθισται ἡ γὰρ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ ἐπὶ τῷ πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει καὶ ὁ προσκυνῶν τὴν εἰκονα προσκυνεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ τοῦ ἐγγραφομένου τὴν ὑπόστασίν.

The following is what the Council of Frankfurt decreed, A.D. 794 (Labbe, xiii., 909) :—

Canon II.—Allata est in mediam quaestio de novâ Graecorum synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopoli fecerunt, in quâ scriptum habebatur ut qui imaginibus sanctorum ita ut deificae Trinitati, servitium aut adorationem non impendeant, anathema iudicarentur.

Qui supra sanctissimi patres nostri omnimodis adorationem et servitudinem renuentes contempserunt atque consentientes condemnaverunt.

* Khomiakoff. See "Russia and the English Church," pp. 30, 218.

† Sir Thomas Browne, "*Religio Medici.*" ‡ Khomiakoff. See "Russia and the English Church," p. 221. § See Articles of Religion, Art I.

out that the ncarnation had changed this. The eternal, illimitable, (*ἀπεριόριστος*) invisible, uncircumscribable (*ἀπερίγραπτος*) Word of the Father, "the express image of His person," had willed for our sakes to take upon Him, not the nature of the angels, whereby, although He would have become limited, He would still have remained invisible to the human eye, but the nature of man, by which He became not only limited, but capable of being described or delineated. And thus the Church of the New Testament was free to use not only figurative language, but figurative art in her worship. As the contakion for the service on Orthodoxy Sunday (when the Eastern Church celebrates the final acceptance of the Seventh General Council in the year 842) puts it :— *

Ὁ ἀπερίγραπτος Λόγος τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκ σοῦ, Θεοτόκε, περιεγράφη σαρκούμενος, καί τῆν ῥυπωθεῖσαν εἰκόνα εἰς τὸ ἀρχαίον ἀναμορφώσας, τῷ θειῷ κάλλει συγκατέμιξεν. Ἀλλ' ὁμολογοῦντες τῆνσωτηρίαν, ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ταύτην ἀνιστοροῦμεν.

The cause at stake was in reality one of the same nature as that for which S. Paul contended in his Epistle to the Galatians. It only remained for the Church to set limits as to how far this worship might safely go, and this she did in the Seventh General Council, which, like the decrees of all the other Councils, was a development, not of doctrine, but of statement of the Church's faith, not an enlargement of her boundaries, but a building up of her bulwarks—of a wall dividing the rock from the quicksands which surrounded it; so that, as S. John Damascene says,† the Church need never return to the beggarly elements of the Law, or "be brought into great fear where no fear was," but might freely worship God in act as well as word, in the liberty of the Gospel. This is what the numerous martyrs and confessors, under the fury of the iconoclastic emperors, were contending for, and, *pace* the sneers of Gibbon, it was a great and vital principle. Does the Church of England really reject it? Of course the Eastern Church does not expect us to adopt all her ceremonial usages connected with it; she merely expects us to accept her explanation of her own rites, just as we expect her to accept our explanation of our own formulæ. There are some sects in England which object to our removing our hats on entering a Church, on the ground, I suppose, that the most High "dwelleth not in temples made with hands." To this the answer of an Eastern would be that "the tabernacle of God is with men," and that our places of worship, no less than the tabernacle of the Hebrews, are a shadow or icon of this truth, and are therefore but venerated with *τιμητικὴ προσκύνησις*. Can we devise a better answer? That there are dangers connected with the system none will deny, but as a Russian writer ‡ puts it, "Where is the man who condemns himself to perpetual silence for fear of uttering idle words?"

In conclusion, I would say that in stating the views that I have met with in the writings of the Russian theologians, and in personal intercourse with them, I have had no intention whatever to attack the Roman Church, still less to find fault with the Church to which I myself belong, and to which I owe all that makes life worth living for. My aim has

* Triodion, Contakion at Matins of First Sunday in Lent.
† St. John Damasc. "*De imaginibus Or.*" i. 2.
Khomiakoff. See "Russia and the English Church," p. 5.

simply been to show that besides a Western, there is a distinct Eastern way of looking at things. As it is our privilege in the Anglican Communion to be free from those embarrassments which seem to compel Rome and the East mutually to exclude one another from the pale of the visible Church, it is well that we should realize this fact. For this very privilege of ours has its responsibilities. I can understand, though I cannot defend, members of the Roman and Eastern Churches not caring to know the truth with regard to each other's teaching and practice, but what I cannot understand is how English Churchmen, who believe both of them to be members of the one body of which Christ is the head, can bear not to do their best to understand the doctrines which underlie the actions of these their brethren before putting a bad construction upon them. I remember once an Englishman who has lived all his life in Russia, telling me that even on Easter night the great feature of the Eastern service was a hymn sung *to the icons*, while the priests offered incense to them. Last year I saw this service at Moscow. The hymn in question, so far from being addressed to the icons, was nothing more or less than S. John Damascene's beautiful canon,

> "The day of Resurrection,
> Earth, tell it out abroad!"

with which we are all familiar, while all that the censing of the icons means, is that the Church on earth joins with the Church in heaven in her song of triumph at our Lord's victory over death. Is not this construction, which the Eastern Church herself places upon this beautiful rite, and which all her children perfectly understand, the pleasanter of the two for us to place upon it? Divided as Rome and the East are, Leo XIII. himself has lately recommended the study of the great Eastern doctor, S. John Damascene, to the theologians of the Latin communion. Shall we not join with him in trying to drive away that wild boar of the forest which rooteth up the vine of the Lord—that "singular" or "solitary wild beast" (*singularis ferus*, *μόνιος ἄγριος*), as the Septuagint and Latin versions have it, and which S. Augustine* says means every man that says, "It is I, it is I, I alone am right," and thus rends asunder the seamless coat of Christ?

ADDRESSES.

(2) In relation to the Church of Rome.

Rev. W. C. G. Lang, Vicar of S. Mary the Virgin, Oxford.

I must confine myself to the subject of hindrance to unity in relation to the Church of Rome. It is a striking fact—one so striking that it is impossible not to see in it the mark of God's providence—that the word unity should be used in relation to the Church of Rome at all. It measures the march in Christian spirit which has been made since the bitterness of former feuds. And, indeed, any deeper realization of the meaning of the Church must bring with it a more eager longing for fellowship between its divided branches. The force of which great movements are made comes usually first as a dream, then as a hope, and finally as a quiet and determined principle of action. So in regard to this great movement expressed in the word reunion. It

* Enarr. in Psalms, Ps. lxxix. (lxxx.), v. 14 (13). "*Et singularis ferus depastus est eam.*" Quid est, "singularis ferus"? Ipse aper qui devastavit eam, singularis ferus. Singularis, quia superbus. Hoc enim dicit omnis superbus: Ego sum; ego sum, et nemo.

began as a dream. The currents of contemporary history, the letter of the Bishop of Rome, the recognition given to it by English bishops and clergy, seemed to turn the dream into a hope. And now we have reached a definite stage; is the hope to advance into principle? There is much to discourage: the difficulties involved appear insuperable. But at least we know where we stand; the hindrances are plain, there is no room for uncertainty about them. It is clear—I would hope that it is now quite needless to dwell upon the fact—that no one in our Church can think of any union, corporate or otherwise, with the Church of Rome as she now is and claims to be. Such a desire is a mere figment of an over-suspicious, over-timorous, party spirit. Again, we know exactly what construction we must place on the word union in the mouth of the English representative of the Church of Rome. Cardinal Vaughan has been almost crude in his definiteness: and of course to every English Churchman it is a mere axiom at the root of his Church life that so long as union is to mean unconditional acceptance of the modern dogma of Papal infallibility, union is impossible. It is true that Cardinal Vaughan is not the Vatican: it is suspected that there is between them a difference of policy. It is certain that there is a complete difference of temperament. But the ultramontane spirit is so universal and so dominant that it may be doubted whether even the wiser spirit of the Vatican could at present prevail against it. Thus, then, we know where we are. And there is much in that knowledge to tempt us to abandon hope. But in truth it is just because we know the real facts that we are now able to go forward from vague hope to quiet and sober principle. We shall be able to pick our steps the more surely because we know the obstacles and dangers that beset us: there was no such safety when we had only the vagueness of hope. Let us shift the point of view. Let us ask not what the hindrances are—we know them all—but with what spirit are we to regard them. Are they to be a ground for sitting still, or only facts to be reckoned with in going forward? That is the stage we have reached. Is there enough vitality in our early dream and later hope, to see fulfilment indefinitely postponed, to face difficulties at present insuperable, hindrances at present final, and yet to become a settled principle to guide our prayers and thoughts and purposes for years to come? Such a principle will shape itself in two forms:—

(1) We shall learn to treat the Church of Rome with the Christian charity with which we should treat an individual man. We know that if we were to isolate the mistakes, errors, and sins, of any individual and dwell upon them, we should not only fail to influence him, we should do his character a great injustice. Men are always better than their faults, and to act on this belief is the first principle of Christian charity. Where the man is not wholly identified with it, we are bound, even when and because we detest the error or the sin, to love the man himself. Might we not learn habitually to apply this principle to the Church of Rome? We dare not say that she is wholly identified with her errors, for we are bound to regard her as we officially treat her, as a living branch of the Holy Catholic Church. And yet we too often dwell upon these errors and abuses, and thus spoil the perspective of our judgment. We ought more often than we do to go behind them, even when we utterly repudiate them, to the truths which remain—the noble witness in every town and country to the fact that the Church is no mere department of human society, but a separate spiritual kingdom in the midst of men, to the view of religion as a no mere trust or emotion, but an organized discipline of life, to the real importance of the great sacraments, and to the fundamental doctrine of the faith, the incarnation of God in Christ. Let us continue to repudiate, it may be detest, the errors, but let us dwell upon the truth. If so, we can never lose the hope of fellowship; it springs from

that charity which hopeth all things, and believeth all things, which rejoiceth not in the iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.

(2) The same principle is expressed in another and simple form. Let us learn in this matter to do to others as we would have others do to us. We know how it fills us with resentment and irritation when members of the Church of Rome describe our comparison, inconsistencies, scandals, as normal features of our Church. But are we not often guilty of the same injustice in regard to them? Let us remember that with what judgment we mete it shall be meted unto us. We pray God, and we wish men, to judge us, not by our manifold weaknesses, and unworthiness, and defects, but by our ideal and the efforts we make to attain it. I only ask that we should in our habitual judgment of the Church of Rome remember this.

If, then, we are guided by such a principle, we shall try in the meanwhile to promote a better mutual understanding between the members of two Churches. Ignorance is the mother of prejudice; and it is ignorance which excludes the desire of reform or the sense of imperfection. "I never knew what the Church of England really was and taught," said a Roman, now an Anglican priest, to me not long ago. "When I did, I found it was just that expression of Catholic truth for which I longed, and which I could not find in ultramontane Rome." And these two Churches are specially ignorant of one another. Let us at least try to bring a better knowledge. And here I cannot but refer with gratitude to the negotiation in Rome, which may issue in a reconsideration of the Roman attitude towards Anglican Orders. The mere fact of a conference held would surely remove from our side the irritation, and from theirs the suspicion or contempt, which this doubt of our Orders must produce. It would remove the chief initial barrier to intercourse. Again, our common interests in regard to Voluntary schools might form, as I know it has formed, not in official circles so much as in separate parishes, a common point through which some intercourse might come. There will be need on our part of much self-restraint and forbearance; but surely these are small sacrifices to make to the charity of Christ.

As to the general outlook in the future, we can have no wish for corporate fellowship with the Church of Rome, so long as the ultramontane spirit—represented so unfortunately by the English hierarchy—is triumphant. It is that spirit which has been the spring of all the worst abuses of the Church. It has made practices rules, emotional devotions doctrines, exigencies of policy dogmas. It is the embodiment of the mere instinct of power. It is so alien to the Spirit of Christ, that we may firmly believe that if He wills a visible unity, He will first accomplish its downfall. But I believe if that spirit were to receive some decisive check, the reform of many abuses, the reconsideration of much popular teaching, would quickly follow. The Roman system is only held together by the tension of authority; that the strain of this tension is keenly felt there are many signs. The Gallican spirit represented by Gratry and Lacordaire and Dupanloup, and we may add Newman, is depressed, but not extinct. How long, how tight the strain may be pressed without breaking, we cannot tell. There may be once again the sudden snap of Revolution, or the slow loosening force of gradual conviction. But it is for the removal of this pressure of the ultramontane spirit that we must pray and wait, and, as we can, work.

As for ourselves, there is abundance to be done. The one practical step towards union with other branches of the Catholic Church is to increase union among ourselves. If we believe that God may assign a great opportunity to the historical position of the Church of England, we must ourselves know and grasp its meaning. The Church of England must know what she is; she must all along the line, among clergy and laity, know herself, and express that knowledge with one spirit. Thus, what we need most of all, is intercourse between the differing sections of our own Church.

It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the evils which come from the severance, not only in thought, but in intercourse, between what is called High and Low Church. Where such intercourse exists, it is wonderful how closely the dividing streams of thought come together. We must not provoke one another to the retaliation of extremes—one section by the introduction of alien modes of devotion and worship tempting the other to hasty expressions which are inconsistent with the standards of the Church, and cause widespread confusion in the minds of other branches. The true negotiations for Christian unity are not so much between Englishmen and Rome as between the differing members of the English Church. This, alone, is a sufficient policy. Those who most ardently desire some union with Rome will promote it in the truest way by cultivating sympathy and consideration for those who at present suspect or repudiate it. The hope, then, must remain as a patient principle. In quietness and confidence shall be our strength. Quietness, no excited talk or vague rhetoric, or empty zeal, but confidence—the confidence that we are on the way of the will of God. When we are young, ideals come with the vividness of real facts; when we grow older, they are driven back by the difficulties of practical life; but if we still keep on the line of the first ideal, it is wonderful in what sudden and unexpected ways the opportunities come to make a step towards its attainment; only we must be in the line of the ideal, otherwise the chance may never come, or if it come we shall pass it by. If we are to see and use great opportunities when God sends them, we must live in a habit of great expectancy. And, certainly, no one before whose soul has ever come the vision of the Holy Catholic Church as a city visible, "set upon a hill," can ever forget its meaning or its call. This must ever be the expression of his settled will—"If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning."

---

(3) In relation to the Churches of the East.

The Rev. H. E. Fox, Vicar of S. Nicholas', Durham; Hon. Clerical Secretary of the Church Missionary Society.

"As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." "Union, solid and permanent, can be based only on the common acknowledgment of truth." The authority of both these quotations, one ancient, the other modern, is too high to be questioned by any member of this Congress. They would go far to answer the question what constitutes a hindrance to Christian unity, if Article XIX. stated specifically what extent of error created a breach of communion; or if his Grace of Canterbury defined what measure of common truth is sufficient for union. Neither authority having made this clear, it would ill become me to obtrude my private opinion on this Congress. I therefore, as briefly as possible, review facts which have come under my personal observation, but are more or less limited to the Churches of Palestine.

Theoretically, the hope of union may seem easier in the case of Eastern Churches than in that of Rome. In the former no rigid Tridentine Creed blocks our path; no false decretals and no papal claims have to be explained away; and no rule of faith required which robs with one hand what it offers with the other. So far as I know, the Greek Churches put no hindrance to the circulation of Holy Scripture, and Greek theologians would, I imagine, accept the canonical scriptures as the sole ultimate court of appeal, subject in some cases to the first seven General Councils, in others to less. But when all allowance has been made for this, the practical difficulties which remain are neither few nor small. They range themselves in two kinds. Those which exist on our side, and those which exist on the other. I take the latter first.

(1) A total disinclination, or rather indifference, on the part of Eastern Churches to union with the Western. Greek ecclesiastics are almost always courteous, and sometimes even friendly towards Protestants. It is perhaps hardly fair to say that their sympathy ends with an obvious willingness to receive gifts of money, or presents of Communion plate, or at the least the flattery of well-meaning but ill-informed Anglicans, but it does not go much further. So entirely satisfied is the great body of clergy with their own position, and so ignorant of ours, that I do not believe there is the faintest general wish either to join us, or for us to join them. And the latter could only be conceived of by them on the terms of our unconditional surrender. (2) But there is not only a *non volumus*, but a *non possumus*. To the orthodox Greek Church certainly, and probably to the others, we are ecclesiastically schismatics, and both our Sacraments and Orders are invalid. It matters not that we accept theirs. I am informed that the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem even admits the rite of Chrism to be a form of laying on of hands, and, therefore, in his view an equivalent for Confirmation. No one will question the kindness which prompts such tolerance, but many will doubt the wisdom of a concession which is not likely to lead to the smallest reciprocity beyond a few compliments from the patriarch. For so rigidly narrow is the Oriental theory, that before even my right reverend friend could be allowed to perform any ministerial act in an Eastern church, he must be re-baptized (with trine immersion and Chrism), and also be re-ordained. (3) The third difficulty, which must be hinted at rather than explained, is political. The Greek orthodox Church, at least in Palestine, is a big Russian machine, run for Russian interests, and with Russian capital. It would not be prudent to make public all I know, but I am within the mark in saying that the policy which rules at present is not one which welcomes the increase of English influence in the East.

But let it be assumed that for the sake of the sacred cause of unity, the historic Church of England is willing to un-church herself, and that her members are prepared to humbly seek admission to one of the Oriental Churches by re-baptism; the question would then arise at which of the closed doors should we knock. There are at least a dozen, and those who dwell behind them are as much at variance with one another as they are with us. But by a further stretch of imagination, let it be assumed that this is only a matter of detail. No sooner should we have passed the threshold of any one of the Eastern Churches than we should find ourselves required to accept doctrines and adopt practices which, to the instincts of the average Bible-taught Briton, seem to be as far removed from primitive and Catholic truth as they are fatal to piety or morality. The liturgies of these Churches abound in prayers addressed to the Virgin Mary and departed saints. The doctrine of purgatory, with its natural corollaries—masses for the dead and sale of indulgences—is systematically inculcated. A theory of the Lord's Supper, as coarse in its materialism as that of Rome, is illustrated by a ritual which, however attractive to the aesthetic eye, is intensely painful to those brought up to love the noble simplicity of our English order. A sacerdotal system is maintained, which our greatest modern theologian has reminded us has no place in the kingdom of God. The fundamental error of every fallen Church which puts salvation by works instead of the covenant of grace, pervades all precept and practice. To many of us also it may seem that the existing condition of the great body of Eastern clergy offers a hindrance to union all but insuperable. Simony is universal. Sins which cannot be named are common in the convents. Many can barely read or write. Ignorant, avaricious, and indolent, however, as the majority of Oriental ecclesiastics notoriously are, it is not fair to judge Churches by the vices of their officials. The less so, as there are here and there noble exceptions, who would hail a reformation, even though their

hands and tongues are tied by the selfish despotism of their rulers. But when a Church, by the public acts of its highest officers, accepted by the great mass of its members, commits itself to gross and profane superstitions, a graver difficulty arises. The annual ceremony of the Holy Fire in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is a case in point. The casual tourist who goes to gaze at this extraordinary spectacle as he does at the devil dances of Ceylon, or the dervishes of Cairo, is not expected to have much sense of reverence or shame. But to the devout Christian, who realizes that tens of thousands of intensely earnest worshippers have been taught to believe that this act means the visible descent of the Holy Ghost, and conveys an eternal blessing to all who have witnessed it, there comes an unspeakably awful sense that for the chief actors it has been little less than the sin against the Holy One Himself. It is true that in private the Patriarch and his priests may deny any claim to have wrought a miracle. But the very denial condemns them. For it is equally true that they dare not say as much in public, nor will they utter a single word to dispel a delusion which, perhaps as much for political as for personal reasons, is far too profitable to be destroyed. Rome, to her credit, has long ceased to have any complicity with this monstrous survival of pagan fire worship. But so long as the Greek Church maintains it, how is it possible that a loyal English Churchman can wish for union, or commit himself to word or act which can be understood to imply approval of a Church which has departed so far from Apostolic faith and order?

Let every allowance be made for difference of race, feeling, and education. Let us not judge others who have been brought up under hereditary influences diverse from our own by Western modes of thought. Let us deal with them to the full extent of Christian charity. There still remains a gulf between the reformed and unreformed Churches which no sophistry and no compromise are able to close. To shut one's eyes to facts is neither charity nor common sense. If union is to come, there must first come a return to Scriptural truth. This will never come till that truth has been firmly but lovingly brought to bear upon the erring.

But after all, what is the unity men are talking about? Do we all know what we mean? Are not many of us dreamers of a dream which, if we were awake, we should heartily pray might ever remain a dream and nothing more? The only unity for which we have any warrant to pray is the unity of the Spirit; and the fashion of that unity is not an earthly conformity, but the oneness in which the Holy Father and the Eternal Son ever abide. The more we agree in accepting this truth, the more practical and the less visionary will be our talk about the unity of the Church. There is an anecdote recorded of one of my most distinguished predecessors at Salisbury Square, which relates that there was ushered into his office one day a reverend gentleman in monastic garb, who, with sincere earnestness, besought him to join some association for prayer that all Christians might be more united among themselves. Mr. Venn listened sympathetically to the proposal, and then observed, "Don't you think, my dear sir, that it would be much more likely to lead to a satisfactory result if we were all to pray and strive first to be more closely united to our Lord Jesus Christ? The rest would soon follow."

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. N. Green Armytage, Vicar of S. Aidan's, Boston.

The three divisions of Christianity to which reference has been made, the Greek, the Roman, and the Anglican, have all sinned, each in its own way, against the unity of the Church and the Catholicity of the faith. But I am not going to speak to-day of the faults of the Roman, or of the Greek Church, but of the failings of our own, however humiliating this action may be to the spirit of self-satisfied English Churchmen, "who think themselves righteous and despise others." For we Anglicans are

at present far too full of spiritual pride, being apt to cry out that we alone are "the Temple of the Lord," and that there never was a Church so holy and pure as the Anglican Communion. But let us look at ourselves as others look at us. An intelligent and unprejudiced visitor from the far East comes to our churches on a Sunday, and what does he see in very many of them? (1) Merely Monastic Matins, chorally rendered by many people, and ending with the solemn oblation by the priest of the money bags. Then, in some churches, but not in all, comes the oblation of bread and wine, commanded by Christ. After this most people leave the church, and then the Liturgy is completed without any of the accessories of worship usual at Matins, such as singing and instrumental music, and without the vestments enjoined in the ornaments rubric. But yet there are vestments of a kind, and wonderful they are! namely, clerical "arrangements in black and white" for every season, festive or penitential, of the Christian year. What a shock to our Eastern visitor with his high ideas of a dignified and Scriptural Eucharistic worship. He will surely say, "These Anglicans are not yet ripe for Christian unity with us of the Orthodox Church; for before they can be so, they must reform their worship, and go back to Divine and Scriptural ideas." (2) Again, look at our discipline! How few there are, even amongst the clergy, who practise fasting or abstinence on the days appointed for so doing? The Greeks, accustomed to two fast days a week, and to two long fasting seasons in the year, would be surprised to know that fasting and abstinence are but little observed among us. When he saw our laxity in this respect, he would say, "Surely English Churchmen are not yet fit for union with us; they must reform their own practice first." (3) Private confession, too, though distinctly commended in our prayer book, is not practised as it should be by our clergy and laity. So on all these three points we have manifestly sinned, even against our own formularies, and so we are not fit for union with either East or West. Moreover, these errors of ours are accentuated by the fact that on these points we are at variance, even with our own Prayer-book, which is more Catholic and Scriptural than our practice. Let us, therefore, first live up to our own formularies ere we call into question the conduct of Greek and Roman Christians, and ask them to reform their service books. Let us confess that we are as yet not fit for union with either Greeks or Romans, and that we Anglicans have sinned by our own fault, by our own most grievous fault, against the spirit of Christian unity and of Scriptural fidelity.

The Rev. S. GARRATT, Vicar of S. Margaret's, Ipswich; Hon. Canon of Norwich.

I OBSERVE that the subject we are discussing is one which, if we had to deal with the two words "Christian Unity" alone, might bear two senses; one meaning unity between individual Christians, and the other unity between Churches. I think it is very important that we should bear in mind that sense which is not intended by the words, viz., unity between Christian men and women; and before I say anything about the second point, I wish to observe that one thing to my mind is certain, and that is, that in all Christian Churches, whatever their faults, or differences from us may be, there are men and women who serve God and love Christ, and endeavour to live to His glory. There are such in all Churches I know of. In Nonconformist Churches there are such; there are such in the Roman Catholic Church; there are such in the Eastern Church, and to all such we are bound together by a holy bond of love, which God grant may never be broken. But then, when we come to think about Churches, the case is a very different one. A Church and an individual are two very different things, and I confess to the fullest persuasion that between both the Churches of the East and the Church of Rome and ourselves there are hindrances which nothing will remove, and which it is useless to attempt even to diminish or alter. There are hindrances which appear to me to be absolutely irresolvable; and one of these is the total difference of doctrine. Besides this, there is one remarkable fact respecting the Eastern Churches which I thing ought to be borne in mind. We have heard a good deal of the doctrine of the Eastern Church, and we have been led to suppose by some that there is a vast difference between their doctrine and that of Rome. There is one historical fact which we ought to bear in mind. In a letter written by the pope (not that addressed to the English people, but that addressed to the nations and their rulers), he speaks of the canons of the Council of Florence. At the Council of Florence the Eastern Church, in the persons of the Patriarch of Constantinople and of the Grand Duke of Muscovy, met with the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in council, and came to an agreement. When they examined what the

differences between the two Churches were, they found that they consisted of only six comparatively small points. The supremacy of the Pope was the most important, the *filioque* was the next, and the next was as to what kind of bread should be used in the Eucharist. They carried out their agreement by passing canons of union, and the Greek Church and the Roman Church by those canons are at this moment united on paper, and these canons, as we all know, since the pope is infallible, and they were approved of by an infallible pope, Eugenius, cannot be altered. If that is so, we cannot unite with the Greek Church unless we are prepared to unite with the Roman Church. That is one hindrance which I think cannot be got over. There is a second hindrance, and that is that the Pope himself claims to be the ruler of all Christendom, and claims infallibility for himself. But the claim that the Church is infallible is just as strong in the East; and just as the Western Church claims to be the Church of Christ, the Eastern Church claims the same thing. Here, then, you have two bodies which claim to be Churches, not co-existing with other Churches, but exclusive of other Churches, so that anybody who does not belong to the Church of Rome is *extra ecclesiam;* and the same claim is made by the Eastern Church. If that is so, how is it possible that there can be union between us and either of these two bodies. It is impossible; because they cannot by any possibility look upon our Church as being a true Church of Christ, unless they altogether give up that notion which is absolutely necessary to them, without which they would not be the Church of Rome or the Church of the East. Unless, therefore, they change absolutely and entirely, it is impossible for the Church of England to unite with them. They cannot, in fact, unite with us, and we cannot unite with them. That is my second reason. But now I have a third reason, and I must ask you to bear with me while I mention it, because I am quite aware that the reason I am going to mention is one which many will not only entirely put on one side, but will not like even to have mentioned. But it would appear to me to be an extraordinary thing, a thing which it would be very difficult to understand, if when such great systems, especially that of the Church of Rome, were to arise in the world, our Blessed Lord had given us no guide as to how we were to think of them; and I am persuaded that He has not left us without that guide. I am fully persuaded that in the New Testament, in the words of the Apostle Paul, and in the Book of the Revelation, He has left us a guide to teach us what we are to think of a system arising in the midst of the Christian Church like the Roman system. I fully believe—I am quite conscious that there are many here who totally differ from me—that the Church of Rome has been delineated in the books of the New Testament as the Man of Sin, the Antichrist, and the Babylon of the Apocalypse. I believe there is a warning given to us, "Come out of her, My people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

The Rev. W. H. FRERE, Radley Vicarage, Oxford.

ONE great hindrance to reunion is the strong feeling against Rome which is born and bred in the greater number of us Englishmen. It is, therefore, worth while to enquire how far this feeling is justified, and how far not; it is found to be only partly theological or religious, and partly also political. So far as the feeling rests on real religious differences, I have not the least desire to minimize it, for I do not believe that that is the way in which our differences will ever ultimately be made up. But I am anxious to say a word about the political side of the anti-Roman feeling. When the real breach with Rome took place, it was in consequence of the celebrated Bull of 1570, in which the Pope claimed political as well as ecclesiastical authority; he claimed not merely to excommunicate Elizabeth, but also to depose her. From that time forward the whole contest was of this mixed character, half ecclesiastical and half political. The Romanist party in England was in a most difficult position, making a vain effort to unite loyalty to their Queen with loyalty to the Pope. The Papal action had made this almost impossible, and it must be confessed that the action of the English Government did not tend to make their position any easier, for our authorities, perhaps ignorantly, perhaps wilfully, were constantly confounding their treason with their recusancy, even when in strict justice they might have been separable; and in consequence, English justice was, alas! gravely perverted, when (as an eminent legal authority not long since pointed out) the State construed a man's theology into treason, and then put him to death for it. This unhappy mixture of politics and religion lasted on for a long time with great irritation and many serious complications; but it is now only a matter of ancient history. The pope has given up the claim to a right of temporal interference; adherents in England have long ceased

to be divided in their allegiance; the political complication has vanished. But the political prejudice survives, though its justification has ceased. The cry of "No Popery" is, thank God, almost dead as a religious cry, but as a political cry it has still a pernicious value; it is trotted out at a School Board election, for example, and serves its turn for the moment; but I desire to put the question to you—Whether it is just that a prejudice should survive when all reason for it has ceased to exist? Is such a thing consistent with English honour and fair play? I appeal to this meeting and this Congress to do its best to ensure that this stale political prejudice against Roman Catholics should be as soon as possible consigned to a museum for extinct animals, or to a chamber of horrors.

The Rev. C. T. CRUTTWELL, Rector of Kibworth Beauchamp.

ALMOST every Speaker has assumed that the divided state of Christendom is an unmixed evil, that the existence of separately organized Churches is contrary to the mind of Christ. May I be allowed to present the matter to the Congress in a somewhat different light? I grant at once that the estrangement, the want of charity, the suspicions, the jealousies which unhappily exist, are stains on our Christian profession, obstacles to the fulfilment of the Redeemer's prayer. But it is these things, and not the mere fact of disunion, that we ought to deplore and try to remedy. May I offer two considerations in support of my words? First, I would remark, the inexorable logic of events has decided in favour of division, and against outward unity. And who can attempt to put back history, or to undo what God may have ratified? But it is said God cannot be the author of division. Let me illustrate from the history of the chosen race, the Church-Nation. When schism appeared among the people of the Lord, and Jeroboam erected a rival sanctuary, and Rehoboam desired to force him back into union, God forbade him, giving as a reason, "This thing is from Me." May it not therefore be possible that this mighty fact of separation, which is unmistakably graven on the spiritual history of Christendom, may also be from the Lord? not, of course, in its origin or motive, but in the overruling of its results to His glory. Then there is a second consideration why I think we may acquiesce in the existing separations. The Church exists to be a witness of the truth, and the truth is vast, so vast in its range that more than one Church organization may be needed to express it. The mystery of the Incarnation is intended to illuminate the whole sphere of man's life on earth; and no one department of the Catholic Church, however orthodox, can exhaust its application. If Greek Christianity, if Latin Christianity, have for long ages more or less separately worked out their own doctrinal and ceremonial systems, shall not Teutonic Christianity also claim full and free expression for its own reading of this mighty truth? And if we look yet further afield, and contemplate (as we are bound to do) that distant time when the kingdoms of the world shall have been absorbed into the Church of Christ, may we not believe that the regions of the far East, such as India and Japan, will develop their own Church organization and their own doctrinal life? Therefore, in the face of what we see around us, I cannot believe that corporate reunion is possible, or even desirable. I do most earnestly believe that what has been called a unity of friendship, and which I prefer to speak of as intercommunion, is not only most earnestly to be prayed for, but is actually in our own reach, if we would only strive to give up prejudice, and determine to understand one another. There is full intercommunion, and there is partial intercommunion. In the early days of the yet undivided Church, when East and West were at issue about the question of keeping Easter, when feeling ran high and schism seemed to threaten, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, as representing the Eastern Church, visited Anicetus, Pope of Rome. The eyes of Christendom were upon them. And how did these great men act? They worshipped at the same altar, and Anicetus in his own church received the holy elements from the hand of Polycarp, to show that, though divided by controversy, they were united in spirit. May we not find in them an example for us? I do not suggest such full reciprocity of privileges as these two prelates conceded; but I do think we might work for a limited and permissive right of intercommunion sufficient to prove our charity. As Lord Halifax asked, Why should it not be possible for an Anglican while travelling on the continent to make his communion, and (if he wished) his confession, in the churches of the country? and why should not a Greek or a Roman Catholic be allowed to receive the ministrations of our priesthood? This is not a mere chimerical dream. It is a state of things that might exist, a state of things that the recent action of the pope, marking as it does a new departure, almost compels a hopeful spirit to anticipate. As Le Maistre long ago observed, the position

of our Church, midway between the ancient Churches on the one hand, and the reformed communions on the other, makes it natural for her to take the first step. The venerable Eastern Church, stiff with age and dignity, stands ready to bless, perhaps to second our endeavour, but is not fitted to initiate it. The Roman Church, to whom, from her historical greatness, the task might seem to have been committed, is hampered by her claim to universal dominion, and the mistrust with which her system (not herself) is regarded. We have no ambition to vindicate, no claims to enforce: let us go forth in the strength of the Lord God. In all humility, as remembering the chequered past, but in all hopefulness as inheritors of a boundless future, let us turn to our two venerable sisters; let us turn also to those young and vigorous offshoots from our own body, and let us ask from them all, and offer to them all, the cessation of a long estrangement, and the beginning of a loving companionship.

The Right Hon. VISCOUNT HALIFAX

A WORK which aims at nothing less than the removal of barriers which have suspended for eight centuries the intercommunion of East and West, and have severed from the Roman Communion almost the whole Teutonic element of Christendom, is certain to meet with hindrances. Do you suppose that the great enemy of souls will not do his best to prevent the armies of God from uniting to pull down his strongholds? We have no reason, therefore, to be discouraged by misconceptions and prejudices, but we have every reason to try and remove them. For example, it has been recently said that we look for the reunion of Christendom on the basis of a compromise of doctrine; but who amongst us has ever contemplated reunion on such a basis? We repudiate as earnestly as Cardinal Vaughan himself the possibility of any such compromise, but we do believe, as apparently the cardinal does himself (if I may judge from another passage in his recent address), that some of the doctrinal differences which separate us from one another are more apparent than real, and others are the result of misunderstandings, which fuller explanations might remove. As Dr. Pusey, writing in 1867, said, "Much of the difficulty in the way of reunion arises from prejudice. English people believe things to be matters of faith in the Roman Church which in some cases are no matters of faith, in others are not what they believe them to be. Much might be done to remove such difficulties by accurate statements. How much is *de fide*, how much only proximate to faith, how much opinions only?" It is not compromise that is wanted, but explanations on both sides. Let me attempt an example, and that with reference to the point which the Cardinal tells us is the "crucial one—the very kernel—the whole question of reunion." "What," the cardinal asks, "is the meaning of the reunion of Christendom?" And he replies, "It means a return to the constitutional corporate union of the head and the members of the Church which existed before the break-up of Christendom in the sixteenth century. Until then all the nations of Western Christendom were united to the Apostolic See of Rome. It was a constitutional corporate union of the head and the members." Reunion, then, must mean a return to the visible union which formerly existed, and the kernel of the question is the admission of the claim that the pope is head of the visible Church by a distinct act of our Lord Jesus Christ. But to believe, as has recently been well said by Canon Everest in his admirable essay on "The Gift of the Keys," that our Lord did provide a visible head for His Church, and that this headship was to be the prerogative of S. Peter's successor; or, with Dr. Döllinger, that a care for the weal of the Church and the duty of watching over the observance of the canons was involved in the gift of the keys to S. Peter, is one thing; to found upon this prerogative a claim for the successive occupants of S. Peter's chair to be the sole fountains of the Episcopate itself, so that every bishop derives his commission and jurisdiction from them, is another. Or, to put it more concisely, as Mr. Gore states it in his "Roman Claims," for the successors of S. Peter to be something which other bishops are not, is surely a very different thing from the successors of S. Peter being to other bishops the source of what they are. In regard to the first, Archbishop Bramhall says:—"Concerning order or interior jurisdiction, I know of no controversy between the Church of Rome and us but one—whether the Bishop of Rome alone does derive his jurisdiction *immediately* from Christ, and all other bishops do derive theirs immediately from him." And so Thorndike. "I admit," he says, "a regular pre-eminence for him (the pope) above all other bishops (which is seen in the recourse had to him before others *in matters concerning the whole Church*), but deny that *infinite* power which nothing can be alleged to prove." But, indeed, when the

cardinal talks of the *constitutional* power of the pope, what difference which might not be susceptible of explanation remains? It is not the constitutional claims of the pope, as possessing a primacy by our Lord's own appointment, which the English Church rejects, but the apparent stretching of this power so as to absorb the independent rights of the Episcopate, and reduce them to mere representatives of the pope. Assure us that this is not the case, and that in the domain of doctrine the separation which some have thought was asserted by the Vatican Council to exist between the pope and the rest of the Episcopate, so that the former could act without the latter, is no part of the teaching of the Roman Church, and you have gone a long way towards laying the foundation which Cardinal Vaughan has told us is necessary for reunion. Surely it is in this spirit of explanation that we ought to approach our differences. To try to make the best of an opponent's position (if opponents we must be called), to put the most favourable construction on facts that require explanation, is the surest way of winning hearts and arriving at the truth. We have much to gain from Rome, but Rome has also much to gain from us. Is it no loss to the Roman Church to have retained within her communion nothing but the Latin races in Europe? Would not the restoration of the Teutonic element, and the vigour and independence of the Anglo-Saxon, to her fold be a gain, the importance of which, in the interests of Christianity at large, it is hardly possible to measure. To me it seems that we are in some sort at the branching of two ways. A great opportunity of promoting the coming reunion has been opened out to us; are we going to avail ourselves of it? Despite all that has been accomplished, despite all brilliant appearances to the contrary, the Oxford movement and the great Church revivals which it initiated will have failed if we do not keep steadily before our eyes the miseries of a divided Christendom, and the duty of doing all in our power to heal the schism of the sixteenth century. Both the Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal Vaughan discern in the present time signs that something is preparing for England in the secret of Divine Providence. What is opening out before us is the opportunity of preparing the way for the reunion of Christendom. Let it be ours to leave no efforts untried to further God's gracious purpose, and to hasten the day when we may be enabled in one vast and united army to fight against all the sin and evil of the world, and to bring home the light of the glorious Gospel of God our Saviour to the ends of the habitable earth.

The Very Rev. W. LEFROY, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

OUR subject this afternoon—it is just as well respectfully to remind you—is "Hindrances to Christian Unity," and the special portion of the subject before us now is these hindrances with regard to our own position and the Church of Rome. I cannot but come to the unwelcome conclusion that there are few hindrances to unity so serious and so grave as the unauthorized interference of any layman on this question in the way in which Lord Halifax has intervened. Loud speaking only proves strength of lung, and that is not before the Congress. If you will bear with me, I will give you my reasons for this opinion. In the catechism of the dear old Church of England, in that portion which teaches us our duty towards our neighbour, we are told that we ought to submit ourselves to all those in authority over us, and to our "spiritual pastors and masters." I should have expected that before Lord Halifax went upon his peaceful mission, he would at least have consulted the whole of the Anglican Episcopate. I should have imagined that he would have betaken himself to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, and to his own diocesan. Instead of doing this, however, my amiable and noble friend, if he will allow me to call him so, does not appear to have taken them into council at all, and on his own mere motion proceeds to the Eternal City to arrange for peace between the Anglican Communion on the one side, and the Roman Catholic Communion on the other. I respectfully protest against any such proceeding as that, and I do so for a reason which will presently appear. On the 24th of September, 1850, Pope Pius IX. demanded submission from all baptized persons to his authority. The authoritative organ of the papacy interpreted that Bull in these words: "The act of supremacy just issued by Pope Pius extends in England to any other spiritual authority than his own. It is in virtue of authority inherited from his predecessors that the Pope substitutes"—now mark—"substitutes the See of Southwark for that of London. Since the proclamation of the Papal brief, the Sees of Canterbury, of York, and of London, have ceased to exist. The persons who in future may assume the titles of Archbishop of Canterbury, and Bishop of London, will be nothing less than intruders, schismatic priests, without any spiritual authority."

This exclusive domination claimed for the pope is assumed by him in his kindly letter to the English people. He never once mentions the Church of England; he never once notices the existence of the most learned Episcopate in the whole of Christendom from one end to the other; he ignores their existence. And in this respect it is very remarkable that his great companion is none less than the amiable Lord Halifax. I see upon this platform my robust and rubicund friend, the member for Walsall, Mr. Gedge. He belongs to the Unionist party. Suppose he entered into communication with the Separatists in order that certain things might be done, and supposing he carried on his negotiations without saying a word to Lord Salisbury or Mr. Balfour, how would he be regarded by those with whom he works? He knows perfectly well that the sole condition on which union could exist between the Separatists and the Unionists is the dismemberment of the empire by the faction with which he went to negotiate. How does that differ from the action of my noble friend? He knows perfectly well that it is not a new thing that he was trying to do, and that it was tried in days gone by when gentlemen waited upon Cardinal Patrizzi, and the cardinal said, "You are very amiable and very kind; I admire your enthusiasm. You want to unite with us; I beg to inform you that you have nothing to unite." And that is very much the case to-day. Cardinal Vaughan says, "We do not care about discussing your orders, or any doctrines which may be capable of explanation." But what he does desire is that you will accept the position which Rome adopts with regard to the occupant of the Papal See; that he is the vicar of Christ on earth, and that in all matters of faith and morals he is as infallible as all previous popes. I object to that statement; I object to it in whole, and I object to in part. I object to the mission of Lord Halifax also: first for what it has not done, and secondly for what it has done. We will take the latter first, it may humour some of you somewhat. I object to it for what it has done. It has raised false hopes in the hearts of the Italian hierarchy. It has, in addition to this, distressed thousands of the clergy of the Church of England; it has distressed millions of the laity, and whatever the clergy may do, the laity will declare in the sight of God and the sight of the nation, that with history in her hand, and the love of God in her heart, the Church cannot, will not, dare not, be united with the Church of Rome, until the Church of Rome ceases to add to the authorized Creed of Christendom, and abrogates the articles which were added to that Creed in 1563. My noble friend, in the exuberance of his half Italian fancy, actually says that there are certain differences between us to be explained away. Will he explain to us some such differences as these? The number of sacraments, which the Church of England says is two, but which the Church of Rome says is seven Will he explain to us the scriptural doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass; the denial of the cup to the laity; the doctrine of purgatory; the invocation of saints and angels; and the veneration of relics? What about indulgences? And last, not least, what about the supremacy of the Pope of Rome? I put no limit to the exegetical adroitness and power of Lord Halifax and those who work with him, but there is one thing they cannot explain away. They cannot explain away the noble roll call of martyrs, who in their robes of fire ascended to God for the sake of that truth which was once for all delivered to the saints. You cannot explain away the antagonism between the two creeds; but we can speak the truth in love, and we can, before God and the nation, declare that the promulgation of the truth is the highest form of love, and that all the efforts to bring about union must be governed by the eternal law of the Eternal God; and that law is fresh from the voice of our Heavenly Father, ringing in our ears and echoing round our hearts, "the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable."

The Rev. T. A. Lacey, Madingley Vicarage, Cambridge.

We were told this morning that one of the chief hindrances to unity with Nonconformists is the sacerdotalism which prevails in the Church of England. When I heard that statement, I did not know what sacerdotalism meant. Now I know; I have just learned. I have learned that the sacerdotalism which is eating into the heart of the Church of England is the denial to a layman of the right to take any initiative in the cause of God. Hindrances to reunion of this kind, and of all kinds, are our subject. I take it that in all cases of difference and disunion between bodies of men, as well as between man and man, the chief cause of the evil is mutual misunderstanding; and I take it that if we would remove hindrances to reunion, we must do what we can to clear away misunderstandings. I hope you will pardon me if I speak in a somewhat egotistic vein. It is well to talk

about what one knows, and you know best what you have yourself handled. It has been my privilege for some years past to work at the removal of those misunderstandings about our Anglican Communion which prejudice the minds of Roman Catholics, and it has been the greatest delight to find on the part of Roman Catholics such a readiness and willingness to learn. If there was one-tenth part of that willingness on our side, the hindrances would soon be removed. I have never met with anything but the most perfect courtesy from the editors of Roman Catholic publications; sometimes an almost startling success has followed the explanations of our own position and teaching which I have been able to offer. A few weeks ago, I heard from a very distinguished French ecclesiastic, who had been reading the book which my friend Mr. Denny and myself have had the privilege of issuing, that in the study of this book everyone of his difficulties about our Orders had vanished with but a single exception. How is it that I have been able to do this little service? Because I have been trying to understand as well as to explain. You cannot explain unless you also understand. There was a time when I entertained opinions about the Roman Catholic Church which I now know to have been ludicrously erroneous. While I retained those ideas, I could no more have dreamed of unity with the Roman Catholic Church than the Dean of Norwich himself can. But I have got rid of those notions, because I found that they were utterly false and without foundation. I have rectified my own ideas about my neighbour, and therefore I am able, in the capacity of peacemaker, to rectify his ideas about myself. Misunderstandings are the cause of disunion. Let me give an illustration of the way in which a misunderstanding may arise, and may be removed. I shall not take a crude, gross instance, I will choose a particular misconception which might influence, which has influenced, the mind of a thinking man. A friend of mine, for whom I have a great admiration, talking to me last night upon this subject, touched upon the pope's letter, *ad Anglos*. He told me that his blood boiled when he read it. Why? Because there was no mention in it of the Church of England. It was one of many proofs that the pope absolutely refuses to recognize the bare existence of any such institution. Here you have a conception of the pope's position, and of the whole official position of the Roman Church, which a thinking man may entertain. But if it be true that the pope absolutely refuses to recognize the existence of the Church of England, perhaps you can explain to me something that appeared in last night's *Guardian*. You have all heard of the Abbè Portal, that French ecclesiastic whose pamphlet on Anglican Orders was the starting point of that movement in the Latin Church which is the chief ground for the hopes that we entertain. False hopes, says the Dean of Norwich. But how can any hopes be false which look only to the fulfilment of the will of God and prayer of Jesus Christ. The Abbe Portal, as you may read in the *Guardian*, is now engaged, under the immediate direction of his ecclesiastical superiors, on forming a society to promote the reunion of the Church of England. In the prospectus of this society he speaks definitely of the reconciliation *des deux Eglises*. To this movement the pope has given his express sanction and benediction. He has thus in most marked and official manner recognized the Church of England as a Church which could be, and ought to be, reconciled to the Roman Church. Is it not therefore a vital misrepresentation to say that the pope does not, and cannot, recognize the existence of the English Church? The main cause of disunion, as I have said, is mutual bitterness and misunderstanding; it is this that does the mischief. You remove the effect if you remove the cause. Mr. Lang has said that the subject of Anglican Orders does not touch the question of reunion, and that if Anglican Orders were recognized as valid by the Church of Rome, it would not bring us one step nearer to reunion. That may be so; but what would be one immediate result of the complete recognition of Anglican Orders? Whenever I work for such recognition, I have in view the effect, not upon the policy of the Roman Church, but upon ourselves and our own people. The immediate effect, and the most hopeful and most splendid effect, would be the removal of a great source of bitterness and antagonism from ourselves. And this must be our aim; if we are to remove the hindrances to reunion. What we have to do is to clear away our own prejudices. It is a scriptural precept to confess your faults one to another, but I have never read that we are to confess one another's faults to ourselves.

The Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, Vicar of S. Andrew's, Southport.

I FEEL a difficulty in speaking to this great Congress after the able addresses that have been already given; but permit me just to mention two very plain matters by

which we may judge of the hindrances to reunion with the Greek or the Roman Churches. One of the speakers has already said that the great obstacle between England and Rome was political prejudice; but I venture to say that the great barrier that stands between the two Churches is the Word of God, which is loved and searched and followed in England, and which is comparatively unknown in the Church of Rome. And perhaps I may be permitted just to mention two points that come out from the study of the Word of God. First of all, let us remember that truth is an element of unity; not only that truth is to be preferred to unity if they clash, but that truth is the only element of unity. I should like to remind this Congress of one or two words in our own Prayer-book, that we all so dearly love, and love the more as years roll on. The words I allude to are in the Prayer for the Church Militant: "Beseeching Thee to inspire the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord." Truth, therefore, is the way by which unity is to be obtained. Again: "Grant that all they that do confess Thy holy name may agree in the truth of Thy holy word, and live in unity and godly life." And may I point out that before our blessed Master uttered that prayer for unity which is so often misunderstood, He said: "Sanctify them in Thy truth" (John xvii. 17, 18, R.V.); "for this I sanctify Myself, that they may be sanctified in the truth." Then He immediately added the prayer for unity. Sanctification in the truth, and no less unity in the truth, is what our blessed Lord leads us to. Let me remind you, also, how the same lesson comes out in the Collect for S. Simon and S. Jude's day. The words are most instructive: "O, Almighty God, who hast built Thy Church on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone; grant us so to be joined together in unity of spirit by their doctrine, that we may be made a holy temple acceptable unto Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord." True unity must arise, not from following the traditions of the mediæval ages, but from keeping close to the doctrines of the Apostles and prophets. If the Roman and Greek Churches refuse to teach and act according to these doctrines, we must refuse to go with them. "Let them return to thee, but return not thou to them." One other thought. The Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the Incarnate, crucified, risen, ascended Saviour, is the great centre of unity. The more we make Him everything in religion, the more we shall be united one to the other. It is most instructive to place side by side two passages—one from Gal. iii. 28, and the other, Col. iii. 11: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythean, bond, nor free; but Christ is all and in all." The more men make Christ their all, the more He dwells in all, and the closer will they be knit together in the faith of Him.

Dr. Allen, Norwich.

THERE are two great and radical hindrances to the unity of Christendom. The first is spiritual individualism. I speak of spiritual individualism with all respect and reverence, as it is urged on us by good and holy men, and I am aware that it is incumbent upon me to preserve my own spiritual individuality and to keep it pure, lest, as the temple of the Holy Spirit, that Spirit should be taken away from me, and to guard it, lest darkness, yes, gross darkness, should come upon me because Christ does not dwell in me; but there is something greater than this, and we are bound to hold it. We want to be filled with the spirit of S. Paul, who said, "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren"; we ought to be willing to be even lost, if that might be so, only that our brethren may be united, and the Church one. That the visible unity of Christendom is the will of God I am assured; for whilst we say that Christ prayed that great intercessory prayer unto God His Father, yet we must realize to the full that Christ was then, at that time, and is, Very God, and, as God, willed its fulfillment, and will Himself accomplish it. The other hindrance is human sentiment. Man is a compound being—body, soul, and spirit; it is utterly impossible for him, by his soul, mind, or intellect, to grasp the knowledge of God. It is only by his spirit illuminated by the Holy Spirit that he learns to recognize and know the oneness of God, and the co-inherence of each Person in the Triune Godhead. Admitted by baptism into a real, personal participation in the eternal life of God, if we are believers in the Divine life we must live the Divine life, believing fully in that unity, and we must live in that unity. Our Lord said there were greater works to be done by us than He had done, because He Himself would

dwell in us. Is not this question of unity one of those "greater works"? Let us be ever praying, ever living, ever acting, that great intercessory prayer which Christ prayed.

The Rev. E. DENNY, Vicar of Kempley, Gloucester.

I ALWAYS isten to anything that the Dean of Norwich says with very great interest, because he comes from the Emerald Isle, and we all know that there is great eloquence to be found in that part of the world; but when one comes to analyze what he says, sometimes one does not find quite so much behind it as one might fancy would be the case when one heard the ringing words with which he entranced us coming from his lips. And this is certainly the case in the present instance. I venture to say that the speech of the Dean of Norwich is one which itself is an example of one of the main difficulties in the way of reunion. The Dean of Norwich set before us a considerable number of doctrines, which he said were those which separated us from the Church of Rome, but the question is not what the Dean of Norwich thinks of those doctrines, but whether his interpretation of what the Church of England says on these subjects is the true one. What we have to address ourselves to is the meeting of these difficulties. We have certain doctrinal statements which there are those who say are different from and divergent from those of the Church of Rome. Now, the question to be faced—because I believe that unity is only to be obtained through "the truth"—the question is, Are these doctrinal statements so opposed as to be incapable of reconciliation? The principle which those who desire to see the reconciliation of Christendom act on is not to exaggerate the difficulties, not to appeal to prejudiced statements on either side, but to see whether the language officially used cannot be reconciled so as to show that the two Churches are in reality in harmony. To give an example of what I mean. The Thirty-first Article of the Church of England is frequently quoted by controversialists of the two parties who are united (as in the past), the Ultramontane and the Puritans, in the endeavour to show that that particular article is directed against the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; but the Bishop of Salisbury has lately most conclusively shown that it is not opposed to the true doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the result will be, if the statements as to this point on the part of the Church of Rome are treated in the same way of explanation, there will be found, I am certain, an agreement. When we find a bishop of the Church investigating these questions in this manner, we have good ground to hope that those in authority will approach the consideration of the difficulties to which I have referred, not with a view of obtaining a controversial victory, the most hateful of all things, but with a view of bringing about that peace and unity amongst Christians, so dear to those who love the Lord, which have been too long marred through the misconceptions and misunderstandings brought about by that miserable desire to gain a victory for the side which you espouse, and which you wish to see triumph. In the past, the desire for union has been lost because of that hideous controversial spirit; a different spirit would seem to be at last prevailing amongst us. Let us try to encourage within ourselves true love of God, and then those statements which have seemed divergent, and which controversialists have misused for their own ends in the past, will be found, under the guidance of the Divine Spirit of unity and love, to be in harmony. Thus, indeed, will a victory be gained, not for Rome or England, but for our common Lord.

The Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, Fellow of All Souls, Oxford.

I THINK that this debate this afternoon will have well illustrated for us the fact that the great hindrances to Christian unity are want of sympathy and ignorance, coupled, perhaps I may add, with eloquence. My good friend, Mr. Fox, who I hope to talk to about this afterwards, made many statements, some of which were absolutely incorrect, and many of which were half-truths. He told us that the Greek Church did not recognize English baptism; but as a matter of fact, ever since 1650, the Russian branch of that Church has done so. But there is a further point I wish to bring out, and that is, that on each occasion that a branch of the Eastern Church has had to consider that question, they found out that our baptism was valid; it was only while

they were ignorant that they did not accept it. Another point I may mention. We are told that the Greek Church believes in salvation by works; but I could quote reams of theology by Russian theologians attacking that doctrine. Then Mr. Fox told us that they believed in purgatory and in indulgences; but when the Roman Church created the Russian Uniat body, she found that there was no word in the Russian language for indulgence at all. He also spoke of the immorality of some Greek clergy. Are there no immoral clergymen in England? and if we are to judge merely by the immorality of certain individuals, it shows a great want of sympathy. Then he said the Eastern Church had no desire for unity; but two or three nights ago we heard how, in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, written a few years ago, the head of the Russian Church not only said they desired to unite with us, and prayed for union every time they offered the Holy Eucharist, but also asked the Archbishop to tell them what definite grounds they were able to unite upon; that is to say, it was not only a question of sympathy, but a practical question which they desired to discuss.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

WE have now come to the conclusion of our very interesting and unusually animated discussion. Of course one rather expected, knowing how men's minds are exercised more frequently by the points of difference than by the points of agreement, that there would be a good deal of animation about the meeting this afternoon; but I am one of those who always regret that any meeting in which we have been considering the things that concern our common salvation should be attended with any measure of heat or undue excitement. I thing the time will come before long when we shall see that these things are as nothing but as dust in the balance. I am one of those—and the same thing may have happened to some of you—who have stood more than once in the full prime and vigour of manhood in such a position that I have said to myself, "As the Lord liveth, and as my soul liveth, there is but one step between me and death." Did I think of these matters then which separate us from Roman Catholics, or Greek Christians, or Nonconformists? I think I can leave the answer to your own hearts. I thought of Jesus Christ, and a flush of emotion came into my face when I trusted that, by God's mere mercy, in a few seconds I should be in the presence of my dear Lord and Saviour. When you and I come to die, these are the things we shall think of; not these matters, which, though they have their importance, are yet matters of transient controversy. We know that our dear Lord is in Heaven above, and He is regarding us. He has been with us during our meeting this afternoon. God grant that He may have heard nothing which has given grief to His loving heart. You may remember the story of someone who dreamed a dream that he went to Heaven, and asked when he got there, "Are there any Methodists here?" "No," was the reply given, "there are no Methodists." "Dear, dear," said he. "Then have you any Roman Catholics?" "No," was also the reply; "there are no Roman Catholics here." "Are there members of the Church of England, then?" he queried, and the answer came, "No, there are no members of the Church of England. We do not recognize those distinctions here." Do you not think that our dear Lord and Saviour as He looks down upon us has a yearning in His heart towards us, and that in regard to some ideas that are not uncommon amongst us, longs that we may be helped forward, and may all be one in the communion of the Holy Ghost. "As Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they all may be one in us." The Father and the Son are One in the unity of God the Holy Spirit. Now whether we look to Roman Catholics, the Greek Church, or Nonconformists, we know that if they are disciples of Jesus Christ, God the Holy Ghost dwells in their heart. And, therefore, there is between us all that blessed unity of which the Lord spake. And although there will be those differences upon which we have been dwelling, we know that all the children of God are united in that blessed Communion of Saints. My dear friends, when we get to our homes, let us dwell upon these thoughts, and let us ask God to give us such a genuine love for all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth, that we may be brought in the bonds of that love ever nearer and nearer to them, until we all grasp each other by the hand, and fall upon each others' bosoms, in the kingdom of God.

ASSEMBLY ROOM.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 10TH, 1895.

Mrs. SHEEPSHANKS in the Chair.

WOMEN'S MEETING.

INFLUENCE OF MODERN LIFE ON WOMEN—

(1) RELIGIOUS FAITH.
(2) READING.
(3) WORK.
(4) AMUSEMENTS.

PAPERS.

Mrs. SHEEPSHANKS, The Palace, Norwich.

GATHERED together under the auspices of the Church Congress, we are met as Christian women to consider some aspects of the effect that modern life, as upon us in our faith, literature, amusements, and work. It is surely a very blessed fact in our holy religion that it embraces every department of life, alike sanctifying our innocent joys, comforting us in our sorrows, and supplying us with the only means of fulfilling the object of our life—correspondence to the Divine will. One chief object of that will is the developing the gifts entrusted to us, and the formation of character. That formation is begun for us by the teaching of a mother, a nurse, teachers—and, oh! how seriously should all those who have charge of the young view this responsibility—who seek to teach habits of self-control, obedience, the necessity of seeking from earliest years grace to overcome our childish faults, and put before us the hope of pleasing that loving Father by our efforts. Almost imperceptibly this formation of character and development of gifts becomes our own responsibility, which can never cease either for us individually or as members of the same human family. We are acted upon, and re-act upon others, according as we use or abuse the circumstances of our daily life. We are to have brought before us this afternoon some considerations of the way in which the customs and fashions of modern life affect the inner life of the soul. Modes of thoughts and observances vary, and we cannot, as thoughtful women, looking from a Christian's standpoint at these variations, put on one side dangers and difficulties in the way of our faith and religious observances. To take one instance of change of thought and observance—the keeping of Sunday. In the wish, surely rational and laudable, of freeing our Sundays from the idea of dulness, tedium, and formality, we are in danger of losing sight of the principle of rendering to God our time tithe, and service of praise and worship, and of seeking too much simply to spend the day pleasantly and easily, as if that object would develop our character and ripen it for the heavenly life. Surely one day can be spared from the claims of society for quiet for

ourselves, for gathering up the spiritual forces of the soul, and for our households; not an unimportant element, or one to be overlooked or set aside. Is there not also need for us to see that the greater intellectual culture of women and their wider range of reading needs to be safeguarded from superficiality in matters of faith? Is it not necessary for us to look well to our foundations, and see that they are based on the due apprehensions of the doctrines of our holy faith, so that as different theories are put forth we may be enabled to face them with unflinching faith, to reject what is erroneous, and so escape grievous perplexity and sorrow? In matters of faith, as affected by modern life, let us consider them in their bearing and influence upon the perfecting and development of our individual characters as Christian women. In the same way I would ask you to consider the literature and amusements of the present day. Recreation we may—nay, we must seek. Of what nature it shall be, and its effect upon us, is a matter of great and undoubted importance. There is no hesitation in my mind as to the benefit, refreshment, and enjoyment of being carried out of ourselves by a good work of fiction or other branch of reading. No period has ever been richer in literature than the present, and all its riches are brought within reach of everyone. Why then, oh! why is it, when we can read pictures true to life, either in prose or poetry, standard works of authors no longer with us, and good pure books of more modern date, do we leave them for works of fiction we hear much talked of, written, forsooth, to warn the young against the vices of the world, affecting to show society as it is, with the view of amending it? There is, alas! sin, unchastity, both among men and women; but are we to bring books into our homes with these sins worked into exciting stories, and purporting to show these sins as the normal state, shall I say, of the majority; novels, too, which drag in religion, only apparently with a view of showing its absurdity—nay, I may say more—of practically using it for blasphemy? Surely, there is no narrowness, no false modesty, in protesting against, in being resolute in rejecting from our houses this class of fiction, with its low, false views of life and its aims, its disregard of the sacred, inviolable laws of matrimony and morality. We cannot keep the knowledge of sin from our children, but that knowledge which is to guard and keep them pure can surely be more safely and purely acquired than through the exciting passages of the sensual and sexual novel. We should not tolerate at our tables, in our drawing-rooms, our schoolrooms, gross language and actions. Ought we not to be equally careful, nay, even more, to exclude the dangerous grossness from the exciting story where vice is falsely painted or speciously excused? We must seek to cultivate a modest, an intelligent interest ourselves in those numberless works, so worthy to amuse, to instruct, to elevate, and avoid for ourselves and for our younger sisters that insidious poison which slowly, but surely, eats away the capacity for rising to the higher development and perfect character at which we should be aiming. The same rule and principle will, in my opinion, be found useful to us with regard to amusements. They, too, have their place in our life, and, rightly used and carefully chosen, enable us, with renewed energy and fresh heart, to take up the duties of daily life. Alike in amusements, as in books, let us avoid what will lower our aims and obscure the nature of the character we desire to form.

My last point is the blessed sign there is of a desire for work—work for the good of others and their happiness. How many of our young people feel they cannot rest at ease with so much suffering and misery around. Witness our workers in the mission field, the arduous training and qualifying for the medical life, so that skill and alleviation may be brought to poor women in India, China, etc., where there is so much suffering and waste of life because there is no skill. Of work at home, in one aspect, you will hear. Let me only again emphasize the thought I have wished to weave into this address—the main object we place before us—the developing our gifts, whatever they may be, to the glory of God and the better fulfilling of His will.

---

(1) Religious Faith.

Miss Wordsworth, Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

[*Read by Canon De Chair.*]

"Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." In these words of the prophet Daniel we seem to see a summary of the last times, and it would be difficult to find any that more appropriately characterize our own. To speak first of the running to and fro. Our gross railway receipts last year were, I believe, 84 millions. Let that stand for a specimen of the rest. Now it would be a great mistake to look upon the running to and fro as if it were an unmixed evil; for undoubtedly it is part of our natural development. James Watt and George Stephenson were surely noble instruments in the hands of God's providence—do not let us speak of their work and its results in a sort of dismal, apologetic tone! No doubt it is true that rapid movement and travelling have their drawbacks—that we are tempted to be shallow, superficial, inconstant, and that this habit of shallow-mindedness is very bad for our religious life, and that we must try and counteract it in every way we can. But supposing we did not run to and fro; supposing we all sat still, would our religion gain by it? Have movements and travelling no lessons to teach us? Let me instance one or two of these.

If there is one thing to which the human mind is more prone than another, it is confusing non-essentials with essentials. Now a traveller is cured of this in two ways. First of all, he finds out what is superfluous in his baggage, and what is indispensable, and leaves behind the former and takes the latter. You will remember the bit about this in Browning's "Bishop Blougram's Apology"— about the cabin that would not hold the bath, and the picture, and the edition of Balzac fifty volumes long.

Just so it is with ourselves. Knocking about the world teaches us what things we dare and dare not do without, spiritually as well as literally.

We find that our prayers have nothing to do with the particular nook in which we kneel to say them—nothing to do with a good many external forms and practices which may be very well when they are to be had, but which in no ways represent the essentials of religion; while, on the other hand, we find there are some things which cannot be done without. Going about from one country to another helps us to realize

the catholicity of the Church in *place*, just as staying at home and going, perhaps, to the daily service at some venerable cathedral helps us to realize her catholicity in *time*. How the woman of Samaria was taught this lesson we all remember, and it is doubtless significant that the lesson was given to a woman. We women are instinctively and rightly home-loving creatures; we idolize what we are used to; we are very apt to think that the way we are accustomed to is the only way, and that spiritually, as well as literally, "there's no place like home." But we forget that our home is not everybody else's home, that the idea of home is, in fact, bigger than we supposed. How is this misconception of ours to be cured? Not by breaking down, but by enlarging the sphere of our sympathies. Our faith should be strengthened, not weakened, by our growing conception of the greatness of the Church of Christ.

In the course of my own running to and fro, I once spent an Easter-day at Tarragona, in a rather out-of-the-way part of Spain. There was no English service, so we went to the cathedral, which was full of a devout and very picturesque crowd. A great deal of the service was lost upon us, but I shall never forget the thrill when the words of the Creed rolled out from those deep voices, and the thought of all the Churches of Christendom uniting in that one utterance on that one day. Again, as English Churchmen, does it not help us when we go to America or the colonies and find the old faith, the old sacraments, the old prayers, where so much is new and unfamiliar, and so much that once appeared important is dwarfed into insignificance—does it not drive forcibly home the thought that Christianity is not of an age, but for all time; not of a race or country, but for the universe? Do we not say, "The holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee," with a deeper and fuller meaning than before?

But the second part of our subject claims us. We are not only told that "many shall run to and fro," but that "knowledge shall be increased." Knowledge, in this case, is not only acquisition of facts, but diffusion of ideas. And certainly both these things are true of our own day. But should we be afraid of this? Is not every addition to the sum of truth as known to us, whether in details or in generalization from them, really a witness to our faith? Nothing is more remarkable as regards Christianity than the way in which (far from lagging behind) it has invariably been in advance of the thought of any given age. The Hebrew Church was in many ways (imperfect as it was) in advance of the heathen world around it, both as regards belief and practice. Far more has this been the case with the Christian Church. Let me illustrate what has been said by a very simple image. You go into some Gothic castle, with its narrow, loopholed windows. Only a small amount of light comes in—the light is sunlight—light from heaven, but our reception of it is "conditioned" by the architectural needs of the age. It only shines at certain times, on certain places, leaving other things very dim. Years go on, glass is cheaper, an age of peace has succeeded that of war. Windows get larger and more numerous, and eventually we come to a crystal palace—a dome of pure light, where no ray of sunshine is wasted for us. Just so it is with religion—it grows brighter, more diffused, it covers more ground, it lights up more dark corners as time goes on. Our eyes get habituated to greater light in our dwellings; but it is not we who increase the light, but the very

beauty of the light, which leads us to desire it, to rejoice in it, to profit by it, more and more. We talk sometimes of keeping our religion "up to date"; but true religion is not only "up to date," but far, far in advance of date, and always will be so. Let us now, as time is short, proceed to consider our own age, and see in what it differs from other ages—how it is the castle windows have to be made clearer and wider than they were; and, next, how our faith affects our life, how the new light let in shines on the persons and things inside the castle! I am not now going to speak of the details of scientific discovery, which have been ably dealt with in other quarters, but to take one or two of the broad conceptions and clear convictions of our own day—for the words used in the Book of Daniel mean not only knowledge, but opinion.

Perhaps there is no word which has stirred our age more profoundly than the word *Evolution*. It was, at first, a "word of fear." To many minds a believer in evolution was almost the same as an Agnostic. Nothing is more remarkable than the way in which, when our eyes once got accustomed to this new window in the castle, we found that the light it let in was indeed, as all truth is, a light from heaven, and that the very law which physical science had introduced us to was one that helped us to understand the growth of spiritual life, the progress of the Church, and the development of human society, and to explain what had often perplexed us in God's methods of working. For the last fifteen or twenty years some of the greatest thinkers have been working along these lines, and the result has been a grander, more comprehensive, more intelligent, more sympathetic view of religion than has ever been possible before.

But will Christianity bear the strain? Assuredly it will. Christianity is a religion of great ideas, great, simple, but universally applicable principles. It grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength. Nay, more, it helps us to grow—it makes us strong.

Ever and anon we need to be taught that a conventional Christianity is not Christianity, that we must serve according to the newness of the spirit, and not according to the oldness of the letter; while the great main principles of the Church—her creeds, her orders, her sacraments—remain unaltered, the methods of her practical working, as well as the aspects of her intellectual life, must vary from age to age, and develop with the growth of human society.

But evolution and its teachings is not the only window which has been opened in the castle. Another great light has been thrown on life by the widespread progress of our convictions as regards *Philanthropy*. Call our quickened sense of human brotherhood by what name we will, there is no doubt that the questions to which it gives rise are among the most important of our own day, and that the twentieth century will be largely occupied in answering them. But here again we find Christianity has been ahead of us. In a recent and well-known work, Mr. Kidd has proved, I think conclusively, that successful philanthropic movements, however warmly our reason may approve them, are not the result of human reason, but are due primarily to something above and beyond human reason. For example, he traces much of the merciful character of modern life and legislation to the great impulse given to personal religion at the Reformation. We may depend upon it that the kernel of all true practical philanthropy is to be found in the parable of the

Rich Man and Lazarus—that parable which our Church with her wonderful insight has chosen as the Gospel for the First Sunday after Trinity, thus inaugurating the long line of practical instruction with which she follows the magnificent series of dogmatic teaching which occupies the first half of her Christian year. Here, again, we have two or three great ideas presented to us, but are tied down to no forms—every age must have its own; but all alike testify that the great leading idea of the duty of the rich to the poor, and the equality of every human soul before God, has never been entirely lost sight of. Whatever may be the eventual effect of the fermentation which is now going on in men's minds with regard to social questions—however things may settle down—we may be sure of this, that no real good will be done to "the masses" by any system which tries to work apart from Christianity; and that whenever good is done it will be found to be because of Christianity. A system that begins in self-seeking, that appeals to the self-seeking instincts in others, can never create enthusiasm, can never construct.

"Unless above himself he can erect himself, how poor a thing is man."

And now let us take another of the dominant ideas of the day—*Organization*. And here again, once more, we find the Church is ready for us. If this age be one of disintegration, it is also one of construction. If the old ties, even of the family, and much more of neighbourhood—of the provincial town, of the parish, of the county, and, I fear we must add, of the regiment, are weakened, we have a vast array of voluntary associations springing up. In the case of women we have, for instance, the Girls' Friendly Society, the Mothers' Union, a whole army of educational institutions—to say nothing of sisterhoods and hospital nurses. But how are we to construct? How are we to organize? What must be our backbone? Surely religion. Take away that, and what have you left? "The kingdom of heaven on earth does not begin in the world without, but works outwards from the heart within," says Professor Flint. "Were there no specifically personal virtue there would be no genuinely social virtue" ("Socialism," pp. 378, 373).

Organization without religion is a mere rope of sand. It will not bear the stress and strain of life, and the higher the aim of the organization the more its inadequacy is felt. Education without religion, hospital nursing without religion, charity and benevolence without religion, are like a home without a mother, like a machine without oil, like a landscape without sunshine, like a flower without dew, like life without love. And by religion I do not only mean personal religion, but corporate religion—in other words, Churchmanship.

But some people say, rather scornfully, "Has belief in Church dogmas anything to do with practical life? Can't we teach children without accepting the creeds? Can't we nurse the sick without our being partakers of the Church's sacraments?" This is a cheap and easy sneer, but, anyhow, S. Paul, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, thought very differently from such speakers.

Some of us may have had, possibly, on the other side of the Tweed, some experience of religious life apart from the Church; of a religious life, earnest and good as far as it goes, but with a *minimum* of dogma, few sacred seasons, few external forms, and an almost utilitarian view of morality.

How different is the effect, even on practical life, of this *quasi*-human

point of view and the divine impulse, the glory given to everyday life by the teaching, in all its fulness, which our Church gives us as Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide come round. One is like the laborious dragging up of water by bucketsful at a time from the bowels of the earth; the other like a great, fresh, sweeping mountain torrent which flows down with superhuman power, and bids us share in all the purity of its heavenly birth. We women workers have a great deal of the prose of life, but we are terribly in want of its poetry. We need to be constantly reminded of the ideal side of things—of the glory of the Incarnation, the depth and reality of the Passion, the hope of Easter, the strength and consecration of Pentecost.

The harder our fight in the arena of life, the greater our need of an inward light, an unworldly standard, a heavenly hope, a divine ideal. "Sursum corda, Habemus ad Dominum," ought to be the motto of us all. One other watchword of the day, and I will conclude—*Cosmopolitanism*. It is a clumsy word, but it means that breaking down of barriers, that drawing together of races, which is characteristic of our age, and to which I referred at the beginning. We may look on it in the light of the seventeenth chapter of S. John as a movement towards the realization of our Lord's great prayer for the oneness of His Church. But we cannot be truly His disciples unless we translate our thought into action. And surely we cannot learn all that our age has to teach us, or act on our age as it behoves us all to do, if we do not give a very real, practical sympathy to missionary work—home missions, missions to the heathen, to the Jews, to our own colonies. We are terribly unimaginative, most of us—we are spiritually indolent. But that is exactly what Dives was—and once again that parable comes before us with all its tremendous warnings. We do not realize the spiritual starvation of our brethren. We have got our spiritual purple and fine linen, our churches, our music, our comfortable Sundays. Can we ever honestly say we think as we ought of the terrible darkness, the sordid rags, and moral filth of heathenism? And yet what is our education, our culture given us for? What, if we see a beggar outside the castle window? Why do we have maps and books and photographs, except to give us vivid conceptions of these things? Most of us have a creditable personal standard. We like to have things "nice," as we say, about us. We teach our own children the Catechism. We take pains with our little maidservants. We are kind to the old woman over the way. "These ought ye to have done," but, oh, my dear sisters, how few of us Englishwomen, with our hereditary sense of small proprieties—our card leaving, dinner giving, even our church going—have the very slightest grasp of our responsibility to the great, starving, piteous world outside! What a scale the misery is upon, and how disproportionate are our sympathies and our efforts to cure it. I must leave the subject here, my time is up; but let my last word be an earnest prayer that we may all, when we say, "Thy kingdom come," try to realize the vastness, and yet the minuteness, of what the eve of the twentieth century is teaching us with regard to the kingdom we are praying for, and shape our own lives accordingly.

(2) Reading.

The Hon. Mrs. A. T. Lyttelton, The Vicarage, Eccles.

In discussing the question of how reading affects the lives of women, I must omit two classes, the first consisting of what have been called born readers—people who read everything, and who particularly resent any suggestions on the subject; the second consisting of those who never read at all. There are people who have been known to admit that they could not conceïve the possibility of reading right through a book; and there are many who, if they were honest, would confess that reading had no part whatever in their lives. Now the recent enormous increase of printed matter of all kinds has not much affected either of these two classes. The second read a little where formerly they did not read at all; the first have more books to read, and possibly, in consequence, may lose a little of that close intimacy with great writers which marked the well-read person of the first half of the century. Since then books have multiplied a hundred-fold, cheap editions have brought the classics within the reach of everyone, newspapers and magazines exist by the score, and something which wishes to be thought literature pushes itself into our notice at every moment. Now, what is the effect of all this? First, let us consider what is our attitude towards reading. How do we regard books? Do we look on them as strange monsters, that must be treated with respect, or as things of which, if we are to do our duty, a certain number must be got through in a year? Or do we regard them as friends, teachers, companions, acquaintances, who will give us in turn knowledge, stimulus, and amusement? We are all familiar with the person who asks us if we have been reading much lately; and probably some have felt disposed to ask in return whether the questioner has been talking much lately, the one occupation being to them quite as much part of ordinary life as the other. Books, surely, should be looked upon as we look upon persons—as each possessing a separate individuality, and each able to exercise their own special influence on our lives. And, in one way, books have an inestimable advantage—they cannot assert themselves, interrupt, and insist upon being attended to. Books are the most unexacting of companions.

But if we look upon books in this way, how can we best take advantage of the great facilities which now exist for obtaining them? Many women wish to read; they like to keep what is sometimes called an "improving book" going, and it is a custom much to be commended. But how are these books to be chosen, and how are they to be read? Are they to be chosen because they are new and fashionable, or because they tell us something which we really want to know? Unluckily, with most of us, the memory does not improve with age, and, therefore, if we read books here and there disconnectedly, we end by remembering none of them. We all know, as people get older, what pleasure they take in reading the biographies of their contemporaries. "I knew so many of the people mentioned, either personally or by name," they tell us, "that the book is delightful to me." We ought to have just the same feeling in reading books about things or periods with which we are familiar. It is like fitting pieces into a puzzle—some bit of knowledge is always coming to diminish our ignorance.

The fact is, there are two ways of reading; we may read from duty,

or from desire for knowledge. Now I do not wish to disparage the first. The young—those who have just left school—those who have not yet formed the habit of reading—may with advantage read from a sense of duty. But it seems to me that this is the means, and not the end—the means by which we may acquire the habit of reading, and by which we may ascertain what branches of knowledge interest us most. If we always read from a sense of duty only, we are in danger of reading much that is quite useless, and thus, while we pride ourselves on the way we are employing our time, we are in reality often wasting it. We are like the girl who had promised to spend half-an-hour a day in self-improvement, and who was found reading an encyclopædia of the year 1820. In his address to S. Andrew's University, Mr. Balfour tells us that "the best method of guarding against the danger of reading what is useless is to read only what is interesting—a truth which will seem a paradox to a whole class of readers, fitting objects of our commiseration, who may be often recognized by their habit of asking some adviser for a list of books, and then marking out a scheme of study, in the course of which all are to be conscientiously perused. These unfortunate persons apparently read a book principally with the object of getting to the end of it. They read the word '*finis*' with the same sensation of triumph as an Indian feels who strings a fresh scalp to his girdle. They are not happy unless they mark by some definite performance each step in the weary path of self-improvement. To begin a volume and not to finish it would be to deprive themselves of this satisfaction; it would be to lose all the reward of their earlier self-denial by a lapse from virtue at the end." And he adds, later on, that "the first step has hardly been taken in the direction of making literature a pleasure, until interest in the subject—and not a desire to spare (so to speak) the author's feelings, or to accomplish an appointed task—is the prevailing motive of the reader." And, although this is expressed with a force which may startle—if, indeed, it does not shock—some people, it is nevertheless true. Interest in the subject is the point to aim at, and without it time spent with a book has no saving grace whatsoever. It may be self-discipline, but it is not reading. If only we want knowledge—whether of history, or of science, or of literature—then reading is the way to obtain it. But the fact is, many people do not want knowledge, and of these people many are women. Women are too apt to live in their own little narrow circle, interested in their household, their children, their neighbours, or their parish, and confident that they are doing their duty. And so they are—but not all their duty; not their duty, for instance, to their children. If we are to believe what schoolmasters tell us, there is the greatest possible difference between a boy who has heard matters of outside and general interest talked of at home, and one who has been accustomed only to household details or local gossip. "We can tell directly," said a schoolmaster to me recently, "whether a boy comes from a cultured home or not." Now this depends, perhaps, even more on the woman than on the man. The father is, in most cases, away all day, and sees little of the children; while, even if he is at home, and his wife is not interested in general subjects, he will not discuss them. It is the woman who can give the tone to the household, who can awake in her children an interest in

books, and encourage them to make reading and the acquisition of knowledge a part of their lives.

But it is not only in a general way that books can help us; they ought, also, to be an assistance in the special circumstances of our lives. Many of those, for instance, who are engaged in philanthropic work know well the use of special reading. We are sometimes told that experience is the one thing that is necessary, and, doubtless, the inexperienced worker is not a very useful being. But neither is there any doubt that everyone is the better for knowing what is the experience of others, and that the most experienced worker will gain if she has mastered the facts and statistics which bear upon her work.

Those who have joined the Women's Settlements now existing in London, will be far better fitted for their work, if, as is no doubt the case, to the practical experience which they gain by contact with the people, and to the spiritual force increased by a life of self-sacrifice, they add the wider view and the truer judgment which comes from a knowledge of what is happening outside the limited circle which each individual can touch. Or take those who are doing the work of district visitor. What a difference is there between the woman, however kindly and well intentioned she may be, who visits the poor of her own street, but who neither knows nor cares about all the various problems of pauperism and charitable relief, and the women who treats her special piece of work as part of a great whole, and who knows something of the difficulties which it involves. It may be said that personal influence and goodness are the qualities required. True enough, they are absolutely essential. But common sense and a trustworthy judgment are also required, and both are developed by knowledge. I do not say that every worker need read through Mr. Booth's six volumes on "Life and Labour in London," but I do say that every worker can, by judicious reading, very greatly increase her own capacity and usefulness. What should we think of a person who, being interested in some particular branch of work, was so fortunate as to meet a great authority upon it, and never asked a single question. Probably we should be told that they were not indifferent, but shy. Fortunately, no shyness is possible with books; and those who do not use them in order to gain information lose a great good wilfully.

It may be said that I am treating the subject from too utilitarian a point of view, and that I am omitting what is really the great charm and use of reading, the recreation and delight produced by a knowledge of literature, the certainty, to quote Mr. Balfour again, "that whatever else life may be, so long as we have good health and a good library, it can hardly be dull." But it is just the utilitarian point of view which I wish mainly to put forward to-day, the use of books, not so much to add pleasure to life as to help to live rightly. Bacon tells us that we ought to read, "not to contradict and refute, nor to believe or take for granted, nor to find talk or discourse, but to weigh and consider."

Now one of the great uses of an acquaintance with what is called literature, with the great poets, dramatists, essayists, and novelists—those who had something to tell the world, and who were masters of the language in which to say it—is that it will enable us to "weigh and consider"; to remain unbewildered by the flood of magazines, novels, and newspapers of all kinds which surges around us—to take the good

and reject the bad. It would be just as absurd to reject them all as to accept them all. What we need is discrimination, and that can only come from knowledge of what literature really is. The woman who has learnt to love our great English classics will not be found spending hours in reading newspapers, magazine articles, and modern novels; although, on the other hand, she will not wholly exclude them. Probably all women should read the newspaper, not in order, as Bacon says, "to believe and take for granted," that is, I suppose, not in order to have our opinions ready made for us and to adopt thoughtlessly the views of the particular paper we are reading, still less in order to study the fashions and social gossip, but so that we may know what is going on in the world around us. And if it is ever permissible to read in order to "find talk and discourse," and surely it sometimes is, then the magazines are a good means to that end; while so many great men have been insatiable novel readers, that they are bold people who confess that they do not care for them. And here I come to a difficult part of my subject, and one on which it is almost impossible to lay down any general rules whatever. I cannot say that I think any class of books are specially unfitted for women; it seems to me that what may injure a woman may injure a man, and that what will do harm to a girl will do harm to a boy. I should divide all novels into three classes, as the novels of a modern French writer were once divided into those which may be read by all, those which may be read by some, and those which should be read by nobody. And possibly some of our modern novels might not wrongly be placed in the third class, not so much on account of their immorality, as of their impossibility, their lack of literary power, and their vulgarity. Perhaps we should rather pity than abuse those who write and those who admire them, for it is difficult to believe that anyone with true literary feeling, or knowledge of human nature, can read them with pleasure. But in this matter everyone must judge for themselves, avoiding steadily those books which they feel to be harmful, or even useless, and choosing those which give them legitimate recreation and amusement. And one of the greatest aids to a right choice is a knowledge and love of true literature.

Now I may be told that all I have said sounds extremely well, but that it is a counsel of perfection, inasmuch as many women have no time to read, or to read at all widely. It may be so in some cases, but I have an impression that with a few exceptions, such as Bishops and Prime Ministers, everyone really has time to do what they want to do. Look at the hours wasted by people in travelling. For those who can read in the train, and most people can, what opportunities journeys afford. Yet if we look round at our fellow travellers, it is not the exception to find them reading anything excepting the feebler class of newspapers, or the lightest of our very light literature.

People, of course, differ enormously as to the pace at which they read, but the point surely is, not that they should read many books, but that those they read should be useful to them. And if our own training has been deficient and reading is not easy to us, we may at any rate encourage others, our girls, and any with whom we have influence, to make reading a part of their lives. Reading is largely a matter of habit, and it is a habit not at all difficult to acquire. It has been said that a woman can, between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five, make of

herself anything she pleases. If possible, let one of her ambitions be to make herself a steady and constant reader. Then, whatever may be her work in life, and however busy she may be, she will find time to read. The habit once acquired is never given up, the delight once experienced is never relinquished. And let us not suppose that time spent in reading is wasted. That life is not the most profitable to others which is spent entirely in giving out; we need to take in also if we are to keep our freshness and energy.

There is no relation in life in which it is not good for a woman to acquire knowledge. If she has work to do, she will do it all the better; if she is philanthropic, she will be more useful; if she has children to bring up, she will be a better mother. And there is no relation in life in which a woman does not need refreshment and recreation. The hard-worked woman who is earning her own living, the woman who spends her time among the sorrowful and sinful of this world, the woman who is oppressed by household and family cares, all alike have at hand a means of amusement and refreshment which is easily obtainable, and which is inexhaustible.

"You are preparing for yourself a sad old age," said Talleyrand to the man who told him he did not care for whist. The pleasure of reading, if once we feel it, will not fail us in youth, middle life, or old age. It is a habit which is not difficult to acquire, and the means of satisfying it are within the reach of all.

To sum up in a sentence what I have been trying to say. If we would have, or cultivate, the habit of reading, it must be by having or cultivating interest in some branches of knowledge, or a love of good literature for its own sake. Happy, indeed, are they whose reading gratifies both these impulses, but either by itself will suffice to fill a life-time with delightful occupation.

---

(4) Amusements.

Mrs. Challoner Chute.

Amusement or play time may be taken as meaning much the same thing at different stages of our existence; a time of freedom from work, and a time for pleasure. The sound of the word amusement gives the impression of active enjoyment, and of relaxation from the strain of daily work.

Thinking of its purpose in our lives—as no part of our lives can be looked at separately, or treated as distinct from the whole—we realize that such times are given for the purpose of increasing our vigour for our daily duties and responsibilities, whatever they may be, as the somewhat old-fashioned word recreation points out more distinctly, and, as such, it has its distinct place in the lives of each one of us.

I read the other day a hint for speakers at such a meeting as this. It was, "People attending a meeting want to know, What is going on? and What am I to do?" I have tried, in thinking over what to say to you, to act upon these practical lines.

We all know something of what is going on from our daily lives, and from the lives of those among whom our lot is cast; but we hardly

realize perhaps how strongly we are influenced by the age in which we live, until we picture to ourselves the different conditions of life in our own homes in previous generations.

The quaint diaries, which it was much more usual to keep in those days than it is now, give a graphic account of the daily occupations of the women in the house, and the reflections with which these diaries abound give an interesting insight as to the habit of thought at the time they were written The days fulfilled their even course with few interruptions, and many little acts of kindness. The little events of daily life were an absorbing interest—the life was monotonous, but not selfish. We do not read much about their amusements, but household matters were a continual interest and a certain excitement. Great preparations were made for the occasional visit to some town, which was a real undertaking, and, when it was over, but for the periodical excitement of a country fair, or a Maying, the quiet home-life began again, with no thought of any further dissipation.

There has been no sudden change, but the whole of education and home-life nowadays accustom a woman, from her young life onwards, to a freedom that would have astonished our grandmothers.

We see this very strongly in all the athletic amusements that have come to the front with something of the impetuosity of their own nature. In the days when the now disused word "unladylike" was the constant terror of women, all kinds of energetic exercise were almost unknown in so-called Society. I believe we may give doctors a large share of the credit and of the responsibility of the change that has come about; though now they are sounding a note of warning, as they find how far the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction. There seems to be no limit to the amount of exercise which some women are prepared to take, even to making exhibitions of themselves in football matches and other games for the amusement of the public, which can hardly be a woman's vocation. We are told there is nothing new under the sun; and if we do but go back far enough, we find there is nothing original in these athletic habits. The ancient Greek philosophers were strong advocates for the muscular development of women in all kinds of gymnastic exercise. There is a fashion in it all. As in dress, every fashion will be extreme and overdone by a certain number of people, who like to make themselves remarkable; so in this fashion for athletic exercise. But, on the other hand, it is not fair to judge any fashion by what we should have thought of it some years ago; it is a thing in which custom may be allowed to influence our opinion as to what is allowable, and what is not. For instance, take the latest fashion of the day, bicycling. Whatever we may have thought of it a year ago, there is no doubt that is has now established itself as a recognized custom; though surely it is unsuitable for a girl to cycle alone in solitary independence along the public roads.

The strict lines of prim correctness have disappeared, but we discredit our rational enjoyment of freedom from conventional restraint if in anything we do we disregard all need for restriction, and there is some danger nowadays of our falling into this extreme.

When we come to define certain occupations as the amusements of the present day, we find ourselves landed in all sorts of difficulties, for the business and the pleasures of life overlap each other in a way that

make it impossible to draw a line between one and the other. What is an amusement to one person is work to another, though both may be doing the same thing at the same time.

For instance, the attendance at a committee, or conference of workers, is a welcome relaxation to some women, freed for a time from the cares and little worries of daily duties. In listening to other people's ideas on the subjects in which they themselves are interested, they gain refreshment and new vigour in the company of congenial spirits. Others find their recreation in some quiet out-of-door pursuit, such as gardening—away from the noise and bustle of a hurrying life, surrounded by the beauty and quiet peacefulness of nature, working themselves with good will, in large hat, big apron, and stout garden gloves, making this their pastime and pleasure. In the days of "Cranford," these appendages would have been hastily cast aside at the sight of a visitor! Or again, a would-be author, unable to take up writing as her vocation, finds her delight in stealing off by herself to an undisturbed hiding place, and putting down her thoughts on paper, sometimes to be sent off surreptitiously to some magazine editor, with all the pleasure and anticipation of eager hope. Or, in the same way, the cultivation of music and art gives an added fulness to life for the enjoyment of leisure hours. There is a new joy from each masterpiece of man's creation, and in this elevating influence a greater power of the appreciation of beauty, which gives a faint insight into the loveliness of perfection.

So what might be classed as work by some becomes an amusement to others, and that of a healthy and wholesome kind, for it gives thorough change of thought and simple enjoyment.

But, on the other hand, going into Society, and taking part in the amusements it provides, has its distinct uses in life, especially for girls, and should not be looked upon as a useless waste of time. It is an education, and comes to a girl after the comparative quiet of the school-room with the same sort of advantage that a public school gives a boy. One of the greatest lessons of life is that of understanding and adjusting ourselves to the natures of those around us; there is a tact, a charm of manner, and a sympathy which are gained by mixing with our fellow creatures, and which enable us to make an ever widening use of any power o influence we may possess. Some afford a London season, some country house visits, or whatever society a country neighbourhood may provide. Social intercourse in some way is a need of our nature.

Again, those who take part in the recognized amusements of society are influenced by other motives than that of enjoyment. To some, attendance at the various entertainments becomes a matter of what might be called social obligation. The higher the social position in society, the more these obligations increase, till, in the lives of our Royal Family, we can see how increasingly important these social duties may be. It is a self-sacrifice which can ask for no sympathy, for its good and influence would be gone if its distastefulness were for a moment suspected. But, carried through with a good heart and cheerful countenance, added to the light-hearted feeling of a duty willingly done, it brings back a reflection of the happiness of others, though it can hardly be called an amusement. We ordinary individuals have need, however, to guard against an exaggerated idea of the claims of Society; they are ready

enough to assert themselves, and to assume an importance out of proportion to the conflicting claims of the many other duties in life.

There is another motive which exercises a great influence on the time which many women spend on so-called amusement. Amusements are used as a means to an end, and no trouble or expense is spared to make full use of the means, and to make the end as great a success as possible. A large acquaintance, smart entertainments, open house, have become stepping-stones that bridge over the difficulties that many would otherwise find in establishing themselves in the social position they desire. In this nineteenth century these stepping-stones never seem to fail, and, provided that the purse is long enough for the entertainments to be sufficiently well done, there is no limit to which this ambition may not rise. The gay world enjoys the good things provided, the sense of refinement is charmed with the artistic arrangements, and with the profusion of beauty, so that, at first sight, it seems as if everyone was the gainer; the hostess attains her desire, her invitations are sought after, her acquaintance is welcomed, and those entertained benefit by her munificence.

But society suffers from the example that is set of lavish expenditure—others think it incumbent on them not to be outdone. So the standard of sumptuousness is being continually raised, and this may be looked upon as one of the causes of extravagant habits, which many deplore.

From amusements being taken up in this business-like way, out of their proper sphere, as a sort of profession, they have come to play a much more important part in people's lives than when life was simpler and society smaller; they have become a study, and anything that can be devised which will attract people, and pass a pleasant hour when launched, is pretty sure of a welcome.

The temptation to enjoy to the full the good things of life, especially to those who have a large acquaintance and are popular in Society, is strong, and many are carried away in the stream of pleasure seeking. From morning till night, and during most of the night, the constant round of excitement goes on. There are plenty of distractions to be had, and they are indulged in freely. Well appointed restaurants give every facility for select luncheon parties and dinners, which offer greater attractions than entertaining at home; and everything can be better done, without any trouble to the hostess. The fashion of living in flats reduces housekeeping responsibilities to a minimum, and leaves married women free to throw themselves into the amusements of the day, athletic and otherwise, with as much or more energy than their daughters.

The inclination to an excessive indulgence in enjoyments is not confined to what, for want of a better word, we will call London Society. In the country the same kind of thing occurs. One hears of every day being engaged with something going on; and so there is no time for reading, no time for going to see those humble friends whose lives are a constant round of monotony, no time to settle down to anything useful; everyone is "so busy." All the same, a fresh invitation to any amusement seems at once to become an engagement, and everything less attractive is counted of no importance, and put on one side.

There is just as much want of principle in this as in the rush of the London season. It is putting amusements out of their proper and allowable place, and acting like some irresponsible beings whose only

mission in life is to please themselves. Our time is not our own, nor given us to spend as we choose; it is a talent entrusted to us like money, and any gifts we may possess—to use in the service of our Master, and for the good of our fellow creatures. But these self-pleasing, self-indulgent habits have to answer for much of the socialistic feeling of the day, and bring doubt and discontent into the hearts of many a hard-working man and woman.

And this is not the only serious evil that comes from this excess of amusement. The increasing round of excitement is a great loosener of home ties and affections. Quiet evenings at home are thought to be dull—home-life is not the fashion; so the husband goes his way and the wife goes hers. She has no time or inclination to take an interest in his occupations; he lets her go her own way, and they drift further apart; with the frequent sad results that are but too well known. It all comes about very naturally as the outcome of an easy-going, selfish life, indulged in without self-restraint or guiding principle. And what happens? A certain set in Society shuts its eyes to the offence against itself, and, with an easy-going determination to let people take their own course, shelters itself behind an excuse of large-hearted charity, and goes on welcoming those who have shown an open disregard of the laws of God. Surely this is countenancing and acquiescing in the wrong that is being done—it is making light of a grievous sin; and the standard of morality throughout the country is being lowered by this example of careless indifference.

Is it the result of the present state of morality in our country, that one of our national amusements, the stage, should in so many cases be showing such a low standard of life? and that in the plays, which are harmless in themselves, some unpleasant conversations or allusions are put which are quite inexcusable? We are told by one of the greatest of living actors that new plays always reflect the spirit of the age in which they are produced, and the better the demand the better will be the supply. It is sad that those who long for a healthier and higher tone of drama have not been strong enough of late to make their voices heard. The influence of the stage is enormous, and the way in which it attracts crowds every night, from the highest to the lowest, shows the hold it has over the people of this country. It is only public opinion and public criticism that can bring about a change. Meantime, surely there can be no question that we, who care for the morality of our country, and who desire to remember our Baptismal covenant, ought not to go to the plays of a doubtful character. Everyone who goes to them is encouraging and patronizing them, and so increasing the evil. Some people who have inadvertently found themselves at a play where they were ashamed to be, have had the courage to go out in the middle of the performance. All honour to those who are brave and bold enough to give this public expression of their disapproval. An amusement, to be allowable, must be at least harmless; if it has a bad influence, or makes light of sin, it must be wrong.

There is another distressing habit, which, though it can hardly be called an amusement, is generally associated with certain amusements, that is the growing habit of betting amongst women of a certain set in Society. It is no use our excusing the custom by saying it is all due to the evils of the race-course. Many years ago the game of "bowls"

was prohibited, because, as an old book on Sports says, "the idle and vicious classes had been addicted to it, and made gambling, drinking, and swindling its ordinary accompaniments." The game was stopped, but the gambling, betting, and swindling continued to thrive. And betting is not confined to public sports; bets are made on anything in daily life. It is the more dangerous because it is the exception for women to deal in such large sums as to seriously hurt themselves financially; but the example to servants and dependents, who naturally think there can be no harm in what their mistress does, is deplorable in its results. It is the same reckless and thoughtless condition of mind that leads an educated woman to allow and take part in "rowdy" games, and "risky" stories, and late "smoking room" hours, or, still worse, in the flippant off-hand way of alluding to or of laughing at things that should only be spoken of with reverence. How will these habits be, and what effect are they having, when reproduced among the men and women in the servants' hall or in village society?

In conclusion, what do we learn from thinking over these things? The Christian guiding principles and underlying motive of life seem to be in danger of being forgotten; and without the Light of these guiding principles, and the Steadfastness that comes from this underlying motive, there are pitfalls and perplexities on every side.

Life is all one, and there is no sharp line between our duties and our pleasures; and the aim of life is not to get as much pleasure out of it as we can. We cannot shake off our responsibility when we like; simple pleasure seeking, apart from individual responsibility, cannot exist.

In the hours of amusement, as at all other times, there must be the spirit of self-recollectedness and of self-restraint, and of unselfishness.

Any disregard of the consequences of what we do, even in what may be thought little things, such, for instance, as carelessness about health, which is a precious gift meant to be used in a life of active usefulness, must be a misuse of the time of amusement.

Any amusements that can injure others, either by influence or example, must be definitely wrong; and this is surely a low standard to take as our guide. Can we not try to be unselfish in our pleasures, and, by a little thoughtfulness for others in the midst of our own enjoyment, add to the happiness of those about us?

Again, the pleasures of life must not encroach on its duties, and a woman's first duty and responsibility is to her own home. And here the pleasures and duties are very closely knit together. The brightness and helpfulness of the home must greatly depend upon her, and the spirit of unselfishness spreading from one to the other helps each one to find happiness in giving pleasure to another. The early training and the atmosphere of the home are largely responsible for the kind of pleasures that give enjoyment in after life. It is sad to think of the sharp contrast between those whose days are all work and those whose days are all pleasure! It is our work, or is it not rather our pleasure, to try and enlist these pleasure seekers as pleasure providers? In getting up different kinds of entertainments, with all the details to be arranged and planned, in the feeling of responsibility, and in the desire to give pleasure, there is plenty of scope for energy and invention, and a keenness of enjoyment not easily found when the pleasure we pursue is for ourselves.

As Thomas à Kempis quaintly says: "If in anything thou seekest thyself, immediately thou faintest and driest up." It is not, then, that certain occupations in themselves necessarily constitute the amusements of life; the power of enjoyment lies in ourselves, in the differences of character, which make some take pleasure in one thing and some in another. And character is moulded by education, and education is never finished until our life here is ended.

Happy hours of refreshing recreation are among the blessings given to us in life; only whatever the amusement may be, it must be of such a kind, and we must enjoy it in such a way, that we can at any moment lift up our hearts in thankfulness to Him "Who giveth us richly all things to enjoy."

DISCUSSION.

MISS ANDERSON-MORSHEAD.

THERE is a hall in the Vatican, in which on one wall Raphael has depicted Christ ruling over the kingdom of theology, and on another Apollo ruling over the kingdom of poetry. This strikes the note of that false principle which has prevailed for so many ages: that Christ and His holy religion ought to rule our moments of devotion, but not the remainder of our time—our work, our amusements, our rest. What! shall He, our Lord and Master, have the one hour which we give during the day, or which perhaps we do not give; and shall He have nothing to do with the other twenty-three hours of work, and play, and rest? The principle which should govern our amusements is—that we can carry our religion with us into them. Any amusement of which this is true cannot be harmful in itself. But for individuals the question is not, "*Can* I carry Christ into my recreation?" but, "*Do* I do so?" If we do, it is well; for in the theatre and in the ball-room are opportunities for actions becoming saints. If we do not; if any amusement turns our heads, and harms our devotions, then, for us, that amusement is wrong—be it even a Congress meeting or an S.P.G. sale. But let us beware how we condemn others. An amusement bad for us, or which may have wrecked a friend's life, is not therefore harmful to others. I remember a clergyman, thirty years ago, who even excommunicated any of his flock who attended the assembly balls. Let us carry our religion everywhere with us. Ruskin says, "His is not the finite authority or intelligence which cannot be troubled with little things." And again, "We treat Him with irreverence by not referring to His will on slight occasions." And this must be done, not by secularizing our religion, but by sanctifying with our religion the common things of life. A traveller once described to me a little door in a church wall in Italy, which displayed a Madonna and Child, and, when opened, the reverse showed a Venus and Cupid. Let us not imitate their spirit by seeking to make our worship amusing and frivolous, but by bringing our amusements under, first, the stimulus, and secondly, the restraint of religion. The stimulus: for if this were so, we should see no more sad, worn faces—not even piously resigned ones, but Christian joy and gladness overflowing. Oh, have we not known those dear and holy ones, now perhaps passed away, whose very presence, even in our games and recreation, was a spiritual education, and that without their saying one direct word of religion. They were so permeated by it, that it shone through the simplest things. We should be also under the restraint of religion, binding us to consider others rather than ourselves, and to check whatever harms our devotional life. This restraint would hinder what I can only call that horseplay of which we hear so much, even in society which should be a guarantee against it. In our amusements, then, let our light shine before men, that light which was kindled in us by our beloved parents and teachers, and which it is our duty to hand on to others, even the Light "which shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

PAPER.

(3) Work.

Miss Yeatman, Greyladies, Dartmouth Row, Blackheath Hill.

In the census of 1891, the return as to woman's work showed that out of every one thousand women in England and Wales over ten years of age, three hundred and forty-four were occupied in a definite way—many in new ways developed by modern thought and life.

Luckily for England, her daughters did not wait for modern thought to push them into activity. Down the long ages, in religious, in secular work, they have taken their share in the life and activity of the nation, though for modern thought has been reserved the task of opening out many new fields.

But it is worth considering whether woman's work has gained or lost by the new methods of thought; or rather, I should say, whether the nation has gained or lost—is the quality better or worse?

I think this cannot be answered now. We are at a critical time, and on the conduct of women for the next ten or twenty years will depend the verdict of the future—on the use or abuse of the freedom and largeness of life now possible to women.

Woman's work has been going on long before modern thought. The question is, has it improved or deteriorated? Work has become so much talked about, people study it more; there are so many questions on the kind of work and the manner of doing it to be considered. And yet there is one thing which we must notice, and which I think very significant, namely, the craving for rules.

In this defiant age, when too often the child and parent, the labourer and employer, the young and old, find themselves in opposing camps; when old customs are broken, often for no particular reason, except for the pleasure of not doing what has been done in the past—in this age there seems to be an instinctive craving for rules on every subject. From the keeping of bees to the administration of charity; from the political work of national importance to playing games; these old world employments are now done by organizations, guilds, or associations.

Is it not, perhaps, like a child who drags his hand away from his nurse to show his independence, and the moment he feels the stress of walking uphill clings to her skirts for help?

But admirable, profitable, and altogether useful as are these guilds, societies, and associations, no rule that we can make or accept will take the place of the old rule to love our neighbours as ourselves. That rule well kept will guard us against one danger that modern women are subject to—that of despising cheap homely work that does not show, or, at least, only shows at home, and of thinking themselves and their work of the first importance.

Surely a woman's best place is at home. This is where she can do most for the nation, for the race, keeping a home pure, true, and happy; teaching boys and men to admire truth, honour, and virtue. Surely that is the highest woman's work.

I have heard girls say, "What is the use of my having had a fine education, of having learned to think, of having brain power, if I am to

pass my time in trifling things, in arranging flowers? I am not educated as women used to be, my brain is capable of much, and I must do real work in the world or waste my gifts."

My answer is, "Clever woman, well-trained brains are wanted at home."

There is a science in everything if people will but see it. In the many homes where incomes are small the daughters would add greatly to the comfort of all if they would only put a little brain work into the housekeeping, poultry rearing, dairy, garden; this last is particularly a lady's work.

I know an old half-blind woman and a small girl who, with the help of two days hired labour, keep themselves entirely in potatoes and vegetables, besides growing many beautiful flowers. How much more could be done by a couple of healthy strong girls, with well-fed bodies and cultivated minds? And how much happier they would be than in lounging about, complaining they had no sphere, and taking their only exercise in games.

And these things, to make them worth doing, must be done properly; not for fun, but duty, by the study of all the books and helps that modern thought has offered to work.

People need have no fear of producing too much, for after the family has been supplied there are thousands of people in our large towns who would be thankful for the remainder; and many who cannot give money could grow food and give in kind if they chose. Then there is a thought worth considering. Every potato grown, every rabbit or chicken reared, is a tangible piece of good work done for the nation; a drop in the great ocean of national wealth.

But all these things require capable women. Sometimes we are almost led to fear that girls of the present generation are not so well educated as their grandmothers—at least they do not always direct or use their brains so well for the general good.

Then, in town life, is it not a shame that a professional man should have to work on into the night, or employ a person to do his books, when he has one or more well-educated daughters at home—young, strong people, able to work, and give their father rest.

And to those who have no homes, or who belong to overstocked homes, I say, "Come out and work, for work you must!" Nothing, no desire for self-improvement, culture, or literary ease, however beautiful in itself, can set us free from the law of our life, the reason of our being—to follow Christ's example, to work for others.

In the home, in literature, in art, in the more direct personal ways of parish work, all the ways that modern thought has opened to women, there is no difficulty in choosing a way, but a way we must choose to serve. We dare not in this nineteenth century for very shame, we dare not stand at the charity of the world. We must earn by some service to our church, family, or nation, our right to the fresh air we breathe in life, and to the six feet of earth we shall cumber in death.

Modern thought has opened out many new fields of work. In the census of 1891 that I quoted before, it is stated that women are employed under three hundred and forty-nine headings.

Happily, teaching and district visiting are not now considered the only things a single woman can do, much to the advantage of the teaching and district visiting.

There are many roads open, and young women can easily find safe and proper homes in London, and I suppose also in other towns, from which they can work. This freedom, this possibility of developing her gifts, is one of the great boons of modern times to woman; but with it comes a great danger, and one that may be recognized as a modern development of woman's work. Egotism, self-centredness, selfishness, unwomanly, unchristian feelings, are growing dangers to women, and yet for these there are many excuses.

A girl comes to London (I speak of London because I know it best). Life is a struggle, in which her individual success becomes of extreme importance; her future depends on the rejection or acceptation of her picture, story, or whatever it may be, in which her work lies. Unlike the old, easy days at home, when, if the elder sister chanced to take the best chair by the fire, there was another nearly as good, when it was a pleasure to do some little service for a mother or brother, when there were loving hearts to be pleased with any act of kindness, then unselfishness was easy.

But now, in the struggle of life for place and bread, when the success of one means the failure of another, when satisfied ambition rides roughshod over disappointed hopes in this restless, toiling city life, where each one must fight for her own existence—the modern woman is in terrible danger of becoming egotistical, and losing the great womanly beauty of unselfishness. And when a woman becomes thoroughly selfish, does she not lose a great deal of the latent power in her work?

I think, through history, it will be seen that the best and finest work has been done for others, not for self.

The best art, from a longing to make others see the beauty there is in sight and sound, the splendid success of medicine and nursing, the strength to help the souls and bodies of others, is best done when the desire to serve is strongest.

I had a large old telescope given me. The lenses were excellent, of the best, yet I could see nothing through it but a mist. I asked an optician what could be the matter. He laughed, and said, "Of course it is useless, there is no object glass," and he screwed on a little unimportant-looking thing, and I could see the cross glittering on the dome of S. Paul's, five miles away.

I thought it was like woman's work, finished in these modern days by every aid of education, training, and brain development; each department and branch of work better taught, more thought out, and yet apt to become foggy, theoretical, and misty, unless governed by the little sometimes-forgotten virtue of unselfishness, and the wish to serve, even at the expense of ourselves, our ambitions, our wishes, this country and our God.

DISCUSSION.

Miss EDITH A. BARNETT.

IT is always difficult to decide when the precise moment has come that we should leave the enunciation of general principles upon which we are all agreed, in order to devote all our energy to the working out of detail. Most speakers to-day have considered detail. May I put forward some principles with which I think most thoughtful persons will agree. (1) Work is a personal duty for every woman; for

the building up of character is the first necessity in the civic, as in the Christian, life. And no strong character can be built up in man or woman without the discipline of steady, systematic work, from childhood until the life's end. (2) Work is a social duty laid upon every woman; for, from the moment when we enter the world, each woman begins to use and to waste the world's wealth. And if we are to leave the world as rich as we found it, we must produce to the value of that which we have wasted or used. If we are to leave the world a little better than we found it; if England of to-day is to be but a little higher, or richer, or nobler, because we have been called to live, it can only be in so far as we have produced over and above what we have wasted; in so far as the value to the world of our work has been greater than the value of the bread and cheese we have eaten and the clothes we have worn. The duty of work has nothing necessarily to do with the duty of earning money. Many women hear no call to work so long as a father or a grandfather provides food and shelter and an income. But the call to work is for all, irrespective of personal wealth. Money earned is, in this connection, no more than a sort of token that we have accomplished a certain amount of work, and that we are thereby entitled to a corresponding amount of the necessaries of life. But it is the actual thing that is of import, not the token of such thing. Our work may be of what kind seems good to us. It may be physical labour, manual work, in which the greater number of women are engaged; or it may be mental labour, the hammering out of new ideas, the organization of various undertakings, or what not; it may be intellectual, making addition to the literary or artistic possessions of the world; or it may be spiritual. Much of this work is seldom paid for in money; some of it never is paid for in money. Spiritual work of the highest kind always has been and will be paid for in martyrdom. But the work has been done, and the worker has earned over and over again her right to the means of life, and to the six feet of God's earth to lie down upon and rest at the end. One more thing about work. We have heard of the evangelizing and teaching work done by women. But to what do missionaries and teachers seek to convert the people? Is it not to living out soberly and honestly and in the fear of God the common life of every day? That is what hastens civilization; that is what hastens the kingdom of God—to build up the character of the individual, and to raise the level of home life. All our efforts end here; and the woman who works at home, bringing good citizens into the world, and nurturing them in the love of man and in the fear of God, is the woman who does the work that most needs to be done; who has best earned by her work the right to live.

AGRICULTURAL HALL,

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 10TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

WORKING MEN'S MEETING.

(1) THE CHURCH AND THE AGRICULTURAL LABOURER.
(2) PAROCHIAL VISITATION OF MEN.
(3) ATTENDANCE AT CHURCH.

ADDRESSES.

The Very Rev. S. REYNOLDS HOLE, D.D., Dean of Rochester.

I.—SOME years ago, on the platform of the Derby railway station, I saw a group of men, porters and others, gathered round a speaker, who was addressing them with much earnest animation; and I was informed on inquiry that he was one of a hundred delegates commissioned by Mr. Joseph Arch to proclaim throughout the land the wrongs endured by the agricultural labourer, and to obtain the sympathies

of their fellow-countrymen. His audience dispersed on the arrival of a train, and I touched him on the shoulder and asked him to give me five minutes' conversation. He turned to me a very bright, intelligent face, and expressed his readiness to comply with my request. "I want you to tell me," I said to him, "why you, who announce yourselves as representing the farm labourers, are so bitter against us parsons? I have lived among farm labourers all my life, I have played on the haycocks, rode in the empty waggons, and began my education at the village school. I have baptized and taught their children, married them, been with them in sickness and in health, seen many of them die, and have stood—

"'Where in their narrow bed for ever laid,
The rude forefathers of their hamlet sleep'—

and I think I know as much as most men about the parsons. I have preached in four hundred churches between the Land's End and the Border, and I do not hesitate to say that, where there is suffering, or where there is sorrow, where there is cruelty or oppression, where there is weakness or ignorance, there is no man more anxious or more prompt to help than the parson. I am well aware that it was not always so, that there was a time when 'the shepherds ate of the fat and clothed themselves with the wool, but did not feed the flock;' when the shepherd resided miles away from the fold, and fed his flock, as the keeper of a menagerie feeds his boa-constrictor—with a rabbit once a week. But that time, thank God, has passed. I am aware that there are still some idle pastors—clergymen of whom it has been said that they seem to have six bank holidays a week; but there are sluggards, and dullards, and niggards in all classes. There are bad landlords, who think more about their stables than their cottages, more about quadrupeds than bipeds. There are bad farmers. One of them came up to a friend of mine with some stained barley in his hand, and said, 'I should like to know what Providence means by sending us such rubbish as this.' I could have told him what Providence meant—namely, that this farmer was sipping gin and water when he should have been sweating in his fields; and Solomon says he that sleepeth in harvest causeth shame. And there are bad labourers who will not labour. We had in Nottinghamshire"—and you may have seen him in Norfolk—"a lounging, loafing individual, who was called a 'shack,' and who would do anything rather than regular work—ratting, poaching, covert-beating, a day or two with threshing machine, or cattle driving. But what I maintain is that, as a body, the parsons, the parish priests, of our day are kind, peaceful, self-denying, hard-working men, and that they are doing their best, for their Master's sake, to regain the affection of the people, and to be the friends of the working-men, whether they work in factories or fields." (Let me say here that I was sorry to hear yesterday a sarcastic clergyman refer with a sneer to those of his brethren who cultivated the rose. Of course he is a free agent, and can close his eyes if he pleases to God's most beautiful creations, and go through life colour-blind, leaving special directions in his will that "no flowers" be placed on his grave. But he must not forbid me to "consider the lilies," nor think to excite any feeling but that of pity from those who know from happy and thankful experience the truth of Lord Bacon's words—"Gardening is the purest of human pleasures, and the greatest refreshment to the spirit of man.") "And, knowing this to be so, again I ask, Why are you so bitter against the parsons?" 'Because,' he replied, 'you know our grievances, and you ought to have been our leaders in resisting oppression and in obtaining redress.'" I told him that many of us acknowledged and regretted those grievances, that the labourers had not received in the past that sympathy which they had a right to expect—I had just published a sermon upon the text, "The cries of them which have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth."—I had done what I could to help them with a club-room, sick club, clothing club, cricket club, offered them more frequent opportunities of worship in a free and open church, but that it was not for us clergy, who were sent to minister to all alike, to take the part of one class against another; we had neither the information nor the power to fix the amount of wages; and that, moreover, there were grievances in other classes than theirs. The landlords were poorer, the farmers were poorer, and that, comparatively speaking, and taking the country through, the labourers were in the best position of the three." We had some more earnest conversation, and he remained with me until my train departed. Then he said if all the clergy held my views there would be no fault to find. I could only assure him that they who did not hold them were comparatively few, and that I was sure he would make further inquiry before he denounced as enemies those who most desired to be his friends.

II.—Twenty years have past. What is the position now? Half the great landowners of England have not the means of maintaining their homes—all landowners are poorer by some twenty to fifty per cent. I speak feelingly. Since I went to Rochester, not quite eight years ago, the incomes of the Dean and Chapter have been reduced some forty per cent. And the farmers? Mr. John Henry Waller, of Old Catton, in this County, writes to the *Times* that "eighty-seven farmers are retiring from business this Michaelmas." And the labourers? They have left the villages by thousands—in lesser numbers from Norfolk than elsewhere—while those who remain are better off as a rule, have better houses, better schools, a higher place in the social scale, but they are not left in sufficient numbers to do justice to the land.

III.—Now one fact must be patent to all rational men. Landlords, including clergy who derive their income from glebe, tenants, and labourers—we are all in one ship, and she's getting uncomfortably full of water, and if we are to reach the shore, and anchor once more in fair havens, it won't be done by howling and firing guns, and hoisting signals of distress, but by lightening the vessel of all unnecessary lumber, by working at the pumps, and by good seamanship. We must have Lord Winchelsea's cable, "the three-fold cord which is not quickly broken." There must be unity, not separation; reconstruction, not destruction; no pretence that we are contending for the common cause, when our only object is self—"fighting like devils for conciliation;" no "Let him take who hath the power, and let him keep who can;" no "Well, Bill, I've got my three acres, and I'm going to dig it and set down taturs. When shall you have yourn?" "I ain't agoing to have no three acres, I ain't going to dig and set taturs. I shall take your taturs."

I am not here to lecture the owners or the occupiers of the soil; but I ask leave to express my admiration of men who, like Lord Leicester, are making important experiments with regard to temporary pastures, and are communicating results with readiness, to instruct and help others to any success they may attain. And, further, I would presume to recall for the imitation of others the example of the late Duke of Rutland, who, when the dissension between the farmers and the labourers began, had long interviews, first with the one and then with the other, and finally did his thoughtful level best to render justice to both.

As to the farmers: the old order changeth, and giveth place to the new. However estimable they may be, and are, in other respects, they are not scientific, and agriculture is now a science. They are not adventurous (except after hounds). They have not until later days been stimulated to enterprise; and they are slow to believe that more can be got out of the land, or that other produce can be got out of the land than now. Well, I can remember the time when all corn was cut by the sickle or scythe, and was threshed by the flail; and now we hear of a machine in California which not only severs the corn from the stalk, but separates the grain from the ear, and leaves it in measured quantities on the field. Be this as it may, there must be some grand developments of cultural skill and new adaptations, the result of patient experiment—(we ought to have "experiment stations," as in America and Germany, at the expense of the State, and I believe that much good may and will be done by our county councils)—and, it may be, of many failures, which shall enable us to compete with the importer. And in this endeavour I maintain that, as to an essential source of our national welfare, every legitimate help should be rendered by the ruling powers of the land.

IV.—What about the rural labourer? It has been to me, as long as I can remember, a painful thought that he had not the encouragement and the help which he had a right to expect in increasing his income, and what is called usury in this world; that it mattered little whether he did just as little as he could or just as much as he could, he must go through the same work day by day, year by year, until he was crippled by rheumatism and consigned to the workhouse. What is to be done—*done*—not promised. The rural labourer is getting a little tired about promises. "I promise to pay, in consideration of one vote secured, three months after date." But *there is no date!* Man never is—but always to be—blessed. Election follows election. The rural labourer is like the poor sailor in the Psalms. He's carried up to heaven; he's to be exalted and happy; but at the close of the poll he goes down again into the deep.

V.—But something has been done, and that by a society which is not only powerful in itself, but which has the approbation of the present Government. The society is called the *Rural Labourers' League*, and its object is to negotiate with landowners and local authorities on behalf of those who desire to obtain allotments and small holdings. It has had good success. In the last year nearly one thousand persons

obtained through its aid either actual possession of allotments or the promise of suitable lands. The object is to give the industrious labourer a start, to give him a personal interest in the soil. An allotment might be followed by a small holding, and this by a larger farm; but in both cases there is a great need for the co-operation and supervision of practical men in the selection of the land and of the tenant. I speak that which I know, and testify that which I have seen. I remember the beginning of the allotment system, more than fifty years ago, in the village in which I have lived my life, and in which, as a landowner, I have also tried the plan of small holdings. At first there was an eager demand for the allotments, which were let at a nominal rent. They were well cultivated, and the occupiers derived great advantage. Only spade industry was permitted; corn was not allowed. Potatoes were the chief production, and the ground was known, and is known, as "Murphy Moor." By-and-bye there was a diminishing of zeal. The plough was introduced, corn was introduced, docks and weeds of all denominations and thistles were introduced. Industry continued to prosper; idleness went from bad to worse.

But surely the first thing to be done, before you offer allotments or small holdings to the labourer, is to make them worthy of his acceptance. It must be quite clear, before you negotiate a loan with him, that he will have the means and the mind to repay it. The size of allotments must be in proportion to the tenant's opportunities of culture; it must not interfere with the earning of weekly wage. Small holdings may be advantageously occupied by men who have other employment, such as carriers, or men having some trade or handicraft; but under other circumstances they must be large enough to find employment for all the time and capital at the bestowal of the tenant. A man who is neither a labourer nor a farmer, who has just enough to prevent starvation, is an object of commiseration.

VI.—But, after all and above all, it must be remembered that, although the rural labourer or any other man who can lay claim to

> "The nobility of labour,
> The long pedigree of toil,"

has a claim in seasons of adversity upon the sympathy and help of his fellow men, there are two friends on whom alone he can place a sure reliance, through whom alone he can achieve a sure success, and yet whom we too often forget—God and himself. No landlords, no legislation, no loans, can confer any permanent prosperity on indolence, dishonesty, intemperance, or waste. And these two friendships are inseparable. Help yourself, and God will help you. First use the gifts which He has bestowed, and you shall have more; but from him who refuses or abuses them shall be taken away even that which he seemeth to have.

VII.—This is a Church Congress, and I speak to Christian men, who believe in the Word of God, wherein is written the immutable law, "By the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread," and without sweat of body or of brain, no honourable attainments ever were or will be won; but by the Gospel of Christ, though the condition is repeated that if any man will not work, neither shall he eat—

> "The penal curse
> Is softened into mercy, made the spring
> Of cheerful days, and nights without a pain."

Our Blessed Lord abolished slavery, but by example and instruction He dignified, ennobled, consecrated work, and gave it to every man, saying, "Occupy till I come."

How many of the incidents of the Incarnation, how many of the acts and sermons of the Incarnate, are encouragements and exhortations to working-men. To whom did the angels bring the most precious message ever sent from heaven, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill toward men"? Not to kings in gorgeous palaces, not to philosophers in colleges and schools, not to scribes and disputers, writers, or orators, but to field labourers, shepherds keeping watch over their flocks by night, to men at work, on duty. What did they say of the Saviour, when those hands, which were hardened by toil, touched the sightless eyes and they saw, the speechless tongues and they spake, touched the bier and the dead came to life, "Is not this the Carpenter?" When He would have His way known upon earth, and His saving health unto all nations, who were the missioners? Working-men.

Aye, and more than this, work is not only the duty and dignity, it is the happiness of life. First accepted as a duty, then appreciated as an honour, then a habit, then "the labour we delight in physics pain."

It does not much matter what our work is, so long as we have this faith—what I am God made me, where I am He placed me, what I have to do He ordered. Because the question which you and I must answer at last will not be, Were you rich or poor, high or low, lords of ten thousand acres, or hewers of wood and drawers of water, but "Did you do your best?" No more noble epitaph was ever written over a soldier's grave than this, and we are all soldiers of Christ with a battle to fight—"Here lies Henry Lawrence, who tried to do his duty":—

> "This, above all, to thine own self be true,
> And it shall follow as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man."

The true Christian is the only true socialist, for he only realizes in heart and life that he who loves God must love his brother also, that every soul is alike dear to Him Who died for all. He who feels his own need, perils, infirmities, can feel for others.

Would there were more of this love and mutual consideration between the employer and the employed. Nay, the Christian would do well in this to imitate the Jewish farmer and his men:—"And, behold, Boaz came from Bethlehem, and said unto the reapers, The Lord be with you; and they answered him, The Lord bless thee."

I have not time to speak of the special lessons, the object lessons, which are ever present to the eyes and ears of those who work in the fields:—

The sower and the seed, which is the Word of God.
The wheat and the tares.
The last great harvest.
The Bread of Life, of which whosoever eateth shall live, and not die.
The birds of the air and the flowers of the field.
The Good Shepherd who gave His life for the sheep.
Our Lord in the cornfields on the Sabbath day.
Life from death The grain of wheat.

My brothers in Christ, it may be that these hard times have come to rebuke us for our want of gratitude to Him Who giveth all; for our confidence in our own cleverness without His blessing; our transfer to others of the efforts we might have made for ourselves; it may be that, like the brethren of Joseph, "We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul when he besought us, and we would not hear"; it may be that if we ask our conscience, What have I done, and what can I do to diminish for myself and others the heaviness of this burden? it may be that such earnest, prayerful considerations, such meetings as this, in which we feel with full hearts our common brotherhood, our common heritage of sorrow, our weakness in isolation, and our power in unity; it may be if we (the clergy) by more intercourse in prosperity and in sorrow, above all, in worship, can assure the labourer that Christ's minister is the friend that loveth at all times, and the brother born for adversity: it may be, I pray God, I hope, I believe it will be, that we shall separate to-night with a larger sympathy, with a braver courage, with a brighter hope; it may be that we may be permitted to act as mediators where there are grievances between owners, tenants, and labourers; above all, with that more fervent charity, which I seem to hear, as though an angel spake, "Let all bitterness and wrath, and anger and clamour, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you."

---

(2) Parochial Visitation of Men.

The Rev. Joseph McCormick, D.D., Vicar of S. Augustine's, Highbury; and Canon of York.

When I was at Cambridge, it fell to my lot to conclude a great assault-at-arms with the most celebrated prize-fighter of the day, and I was able, somehow or other, to gain a great victory over him. Some years passed away, and a friend of mine was walking down the streets of Bradford, when he heard two navvies talking together. One of them said to the other, "What are you going to do to-night?" He said, "I am going to church." "What, Bill, you go to church? Why the heavens will drop." He answered, "I am going to hear a man of the name of McCormick preach. They tell me he can fight." Now, why have I told this incident? and it

requires a little Irish modesty to tell it. It is because of this: I remember a clergyman addressing a meeting of working-men on one occasion, and he put his hands into his pockets, and he cocked his head on one side and said: "Now, you fellows, listen to me." I felt the old spirit coming into me, and I should have liked to exercise my Cambridge skill and laid him upon his back; for there is no greater impertinence than to address working-men after that manner, and working-men are not in the slightest degree deceived by a familiarity which is most unbecoming.

Now I would address you to-night as the prince of speakers at working-men's meetings—the Dean of Rochester—has just addressed you, first of all as gentlemen. I opened my dictionary, and I looked out the word "gentleman." The definition given was, "A man raised above the vulgar by his character; one gentle and of refined manners." Well, I think in this audience there are some who, through the grace of God, have risen to a high and noble state, and, therefore, they ought to be dignified by the name of gentlemen. Then I remember that I am also a minister of Christ, and that brings in the other title given to you by the Dean of Rochester, "brethren." There is no brotherhood like that which is connected with Christianity. I hope that you will not think that I am too conceited in saying, I do not believe that of all Christian brotherhood there is any brotherhood equal to the brotherhood of the Church of England. So I address you as brethren.

Now I have had a text given to me; and sometimes we clergymen divide our texts, though we do not always tell the congregation what we are doing. My text is: "Parochial Visitation of Men." There is first of all "visitation.' Well, that is according to Scriptural example. The Apostle Paul visited from house to house. Then there is "parochial" visitation; and thank God in this country the law has made boundaries of parishes, and the clergymen that are appointed to these parishes are bound to pay attention to the wants of all their parishioners. It is a great gain, and some of our Nonconformist brethren are finding out now that it is not enough for the minister to work at his sermons in the study, but that if he wishes to retain his flock he must visit them in their houses. And the other branch of my subject is the visitation of "men." Now they say that an Irishman has this gift—that he has a good eye for a pretty girl and for a good horse. An Irishman, speaking at a public meeting, when he was praising the ladies, in a burst of eloquence said: "I tell you what it is, my friends, the girls are the bhoys for us." We all know the great value, in connection with religion, of women. It has been said that it was by a woman that sin came into the world; but lest man should ever reproach her, it was by a woman that a Saviour came into the world. Women waited upon our blessed Master and ministered to Him of their substance. It is a singular circumstance, but one worthy of recollection, that the person who did most for the furtherance of the Gospel that we know of during our Lord's life was a woman, whom I think S. Chrysostom called "the Apostle of the Samaritans." And it was a woman that our Lord told to go and announce to His Apostles the great fundamental doctrine of the resurrection from the dead. But it is not of women that I have to talk to-night. We thank God for their services, and they are most devoted services in the days in which we live.

My text says that it is the visitation of men. It is very easy for me to utter those words; but think, my friends, what a grand person a true man is; what wonderful thoughts and conceptions he may have; what a will he may exercise on the side of everything that is real, and bright, and beautiful. There is one thing about the secularist creed which I think is most unbecoming, and it is this: that it cramps and thwarts the aspirations of man by only fixing him down to the day in which he lives, as if man had not a mind that could contemplate the vast universe of God, and build up hopes which a great and holy Creator will never disappoint. Have you not yourselves discovered this truth—that no secularist poet and no secularist artist ever does anything that is worthy of the name of genius, because he cannot see in nature the God who made nature, and he does not allow his mind to be exercised with a great hope concerning the grand and the glorious future which the great Creator has made for those who love Him. Have you not looked sometimes upon a magnificent sunset, and tried to people it in your imagination with the angels that surround the throne of God, and the white-robed multitude of the saints before the throne, and thought of Him who sits upon the throne in front of that halo of light in which God has been pleased to hide Himself? No, I hate the secularist creed. What I have to do to-night is to talk to men.

But I wish you to understand that when we come to visit you, we are entering into what is legitimately called your castle. If we behave properly, we shall never attempt to enter inside your door without asking permission to do so. We shall

not force our presence upon you, but we shall try to behave, as I am quite sure the clergy who are listening to my voice do, with courtesy towards you, because you are members of Christ's family and of a common brotherhood.

But there are certain things which I think you ought not to expect from us in our visitation. In the first place, you must not expect us to solve all your problems. In the days in which we live, men's minds are active, and you can easily ask questions that it is not so very easy for us to answer; and sometimes the highest wisdom is for the clergyman to say, "I am not competent to deal with the enquiry that you have placed before me." You yourselves will respect a man who admits that there are questions that may occupy the highest intellect, and yet may not be satisfactorily solved. A friend of mine was going out of church on one occasion, and a gentleman came up to him and said, "Sir, I have the greatest pleasure in presenting you with a guinea." My friend said, "May I ask the reason?" The gentleman replied, "Well, I made a vow some time ago, that if ever I heard a clergyman say that there was anything in the Scriptures that he could not understand, I would give him a guinea. You have told us to-night that you could not get at the bottom of the meaning of a particular verse, and there is your guinea." You know that sometimes politicians are bothered by questions which are asked by smart members of their audiences. One gentleman was addressed after this fashion: "I want Mr. So-and-so to say 'yes' or 'no' to a plain question. I do not want him to beat about the bush; that is always what he is in the habit of doing." The question was asked, and then up got the would-be member of Parliament and said, "Well, Mr. Chairman, before I answer that question, it is necessary—" "Ah," said the man that put the question, "there you are; you cannot say 'yes' or 'no' to a plain question." So the candidate turned round and said: "Now, my good man, will you say 'yes' or 'no' to a plain question?" "Certainly I will," said the questioner, before about five thousand people. "Then," asked the candidate, "are you as great a fool as you look, or as other people think you?" He did not answer the question.

There is another thing also. You must not expect us to help you out of all your difficulties. We will do our best to give you relief or advice, but there are occasions when the ability is beyond us. I dare say that some of you have made mistakes in your love affairs. Men do. Not very long ago I received a letter which I am going to read to you. "Dear Mister, i got marred for life i sorry to say to a woman at your church and one of your men marred us a year ago and i want to now if you cant unmary me cause i dont care fur it an i never shud, but Mary was alwas a-doging me to mary her which you now i did, to my sorer. dont send a letter to home becaus Mary whould hopen it an their would be a row send it Marowbone an Clever pub to be called fur i will pay you more than befor if you can do the job caus i want no more on it." Then referring to my curate he said "That big black chap with a long neck mared us." The moral of that is, do not make mistakes in your love affairs. There are over and over again cases that arise in connection with real want. There is not a clergyman present at this meeting that would not do everything in his power to help a man who had put his working implements for a time into pawn, and who led and was well known to lead an honest and sober life; but our pockets are not full of gold, and our heads are not all very soft. We hope that we have tender and soft hearts, but you know sometimes we clergy are taken in, and that may make you imagine that we are a little cold and indifferent towards some who solicit us. It is not really so. At my own church at Hull, a man came up to me and said, "Mister McCormick I belave." I need not tell you where he came from. And I said "Yes." Then he said, "I would be glad if you would give me something." So I asked, "Where do you come from?" "Oh, I do not belong to these parts at all, but I worked under your father." "Well," I said, "you know the money that I have to give I must give to the men who belong to my own parish." "Oh," he said, "my name is McCormick, too." So I replied, "I am very sorry, but that won't help you." "Well then," he said, "this is the first time that I ever was ashamed of the name." I think that I got the worst of that little encounter.

The third thing that I want to say to you is, do not expect us to side with you against the rich. Our business is to deal with men who have common virtues and common faults. A leading sceptic some time ago said that the clergy were afraid of using the language of S. James towards their richer brethren. It was a slander upon the clergy. There is, I suppose, scarcely a clergyman in this place that in his expositions has not gone carefully through S. James's Epistle, and kept back nothing from his hearers; and the great advantage of the position that we occupy as clergymen of the Church of England is, that we are independent, and that we are not

governed by our congregations, but that we give utterance to what we believe to be the truth of God. In the life of that remarkable man, Lord Beaconsfield, Mr. Froude points out that Lord Beaconsfield had a regular consistent policy throughout the whole of his career, and that policy was to unite the rich and upper classes with the poor classes. It was a sagacious policy, because he knew, as you are finding out yourselves, that the real governing power will, in the future, rest in the hands of the working classes. But we have a nobler ambition than that, and it is to unite all classes of the community, high and middle and low, in order that they may all be believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, and followers in His blessed footsteps.

There is only one other point that I shall refer to in this connection. Do not expect us to go amongst you as faddists. You know that there are some men who have all kinds of hobbies. You are visited, I suppose, by socialists sometimes—Christian socialists and other socialists. Well, I have not a word to say against them, if they only act upon right principles. Sometimes you are visited by great advocates of temperance, and all of us are in favour of true temperance. Sometimes you are visited by those who think that the happiness of men is entirely associated with sanitary arrangements. Well, we all hope that you can get nice, clean, and sweet homes. If you have not, God grant that you may speedily possess them. And then you are visited by men who call themselves by this religion and that religion and the other religion. I dare say that some of you are like the woman of Samaria. The Jews wanted the Samaritans to worship at Jerusalem, and their own people said that they were to worship upon their own mountain; and Pharisees said this, and the Sadducees said that, till she was in such a state of perplexity that she heaved a sigh and said, "I know that Messias cometh which is called Christ. When He is come He will tell us all things." Now, my dear friends, as far as we are concerned, the great solution of the greatest difficulties that we have to face is in placing before you our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We welcome any assistance which will be for your benefit, but recollect that amongst those to whom I have referred there are many who leave out of consideration that which is the most essential factor as far as you are concerned, namely, the factor of sin. We come as ministers of Christ to carry out our Lord's mission—to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, to heal the broken-hearted, and to give deliverance to the captives. And this work commends itself to you. We have no interest to serve in carrying it out as far as you are concerned. What is there that you can give us that will recompense us for the risk that we are running in going into your houses when the fever is there? What is there that you will give to us when we come, and, like a brother, press your hand in the time of sorrow, and weep tears of sympathy with you. What have we to learn? What have we to get? Nothing—as far as this earth is concerned. But I would have you to understand that the whole matter of profit and of benefit does not rest on your side. When God makes use of us so that you have a noble and courageous faith, when God so blesses our word that you shake yourselves free from evils that degrade and that ruin a man, then we have our blessed reward, and that reward has its fruition in the world which is to come. When once by our visitation and prayer and effort we are the means of bringing you to Christ, then there is a union between us that never will be dissolved. When the great day comes, and the Lord sits upon His great white throne, then it is that they who sow and they who reap shall rejoice together; and our mission as clergymen is that in that day those to whom we minister may be our joy and crown of rejoicing in the presence of the Lord.

---

(3) Attendance at Church.

The Right Rev. A. T. Lloyd, D.D., Bishop Suffragan of Thetford.

Men and Brethren—I have been asked to speak to you this evening on the subject of attendance in church. I am not sure whether that means non-attendance in church, but I am encouraged to speak on this subject because I have been told that these subjects have been chosen especially by the working-men themselves. I am rather in a difficulty, because I think that on this subject it would be far more profitable to us if a working-man himself would get up and tell us why working-men do not come to church. I have had chats with a good many working-men, and have tried to persuade them to come, and they always agree and acknowledge, "It is very right what you say," but they never come! But I have always believed and thought that it is rather a libel on the working-men to single them out as the class

that do not come to church. I wish that a great many more came than do, but I should say that that was true of every class of men, and I believe that there are quite as many working-men who come to church, and come under far greater difficulties, than there are of the upper classes. I rather fancy that if an agricultural labourer were to speak on this subject—and there are some here to-night—he would say something of this kind, "If you, sir, had to get up at half-past six in the morning, and go out and feed cattle, and stamp about in the nasty slushy farmyard till about ten or eleven, and come home and get a snack to eat, and go out again at two, and go through the same process till about five, and come home and change your dirty things and sit down by a warm fire and have a good cup of tea, and then be told to turn out and go to church, I do not think that you, or many men in the upper classes of society, would dream of doing such a thing." But it is a fact, you know, not of working-men only, but of all men, that they are in a great number of churches conspicuous by their absence.

Well, I shall try to put myself into the place of a working-man, and look at the question from what I conceive might be his point of view. As in most things, I suppose that there are faults on both sides; I freely acknowledge that there may be a good many faults on the side of us parsons.

If I was a working-man, I should quite enter into the feeling that I am sure working-men have when they say, "When I go to church, I go to hear a good sermon; and by a good sermon I mean—not an eloquent sermon, not a clever sermon, but a sermon that I can understand; a sermon that does not go right over my head, but that enters into my life and into my difficulties; a sermon that comes out from the parson's heart and enters into my heart." I feel pretty sure of this, that in the case of ninety-nine out of every hundred clergy the sermon does come from their hearts, though it may not perhaps enter quite into the difficulties and trials of the labourer's life. I can only say, after having heard the eloquent words of Canon McCormick, that a house-going parson will make a church-going people; and though I speak in fear and trembling in the midst of so many of my brother clergy, I may say to them, with all humility, that they will never get the true material for a good heart-speaking sermon so much as when they visit from house to house, and learn what the working-man thinks, and what the working-man has to suffer.

Then I can fancy someone saying, "I go to church; but when I go I like to be comfortable." Well, we must acknowledge that some of our churches are very far from comfortable, and for a man who works during the week and goes to church and has to sit bolt upright, with the seats at right angles, and impossible to kneel in, and uncomfortable to sit in, and only just giving room to stand, it is almost too much to expect that a man will very often be found there. But then I think that that is a thing that is being gradually improved already among us; and when better times come, I hope that our churches in East Anglia will all of them afford comfort for the sitting of the working-man, and capacity for his kneeling.

Then I can imagine a working-man saying, "When I go to church, I do not like those anthems." Well, I am afraid that I am unmusical enough to thoroughly agree with working-men in that respect. I do not like those anthems either. I am thoroughly unmusical, but I own, not to a sneaking delight, but to a real honest delight in those good old-fashioned tunes that we so seldom hear. I like the Old Hundredth, with all its rings and runs, in the old-fashioned way, which I have not heard for years. I am quite sure that if we could go back to some of those old tunes, with their dear old runs that I remember when I was a boy, we should have the congregation joining in in a way in which they do not join now. There is a musical lecture being given at this present time in S. Andrew's Hall, and I am sure that Dr. Armes will not agree with me. He is giving a lecture, with illustrations. If I could only give you an illustration of what I mean to-night, I am afraid that many of you would leave the hall, so I will not try. But I do like for myself, and I am sure that many working people like, not only sermons that we can understand, but tunes that we can sing.

Well, I might go on to other things as to what I thought, but I am only speaking, of course, at random as to what working-men think about their non-attendance in church.

Now, will you let me come to the parson's side of the question, and tell you what I think, and I know that you will not mind me speaking plainly to you. I believe that one of the reasons why men do not come to church more than they do will be found in the lives of those who do come to church. In our Lord's day there were two distinct classes of men, the one called the Pharisees, and the other the Sadducees.

The Pharisees had a great deal of religious profession. They loved the best seats in the church. They were always found at their prayers, and quite right too; but their fault was that their religion was a sham, that they had not really either the will or the faith to carry out that which their outward profession ought to have made them do, and the consequence was that there were Pharisees on the one hand, with profession and no practice, and there were the Saducees, who believed nothing, on the other. I do not think that I should be wrong in saying that in our Lord's time one of the chief reasons of the existence of the Sadducees was the lives of the Pharisees. My brothers, if we men who do come to church would only in our daily life carry out that which we profess in church, you may depend upon it that there would be many more men found at our side in church. It is a very good thing to go to church and to rehearse the articles of our Christian faith. It is a grand thing to possess those articles of the Apostles' Creed; but it is a far grander thing to go and live your creed. If the man in the farmyard, or the workshop, or the market-place, would only carry out in his own daily life that which he professes in church, there would be far fewer Sadducees in our day than there are.

I believe that another reason is to be found in the lack of moral courage that there is, especially amongst men. There is a kind of feeling abroad, you know, and I expect that it is spread over all classes of men, though it is a false, shameful feeling, though it is one which men are not ashamed to give expression to, that religion is a thing that is all very well for women and for children. So much the better for the women and the children. The conceit of this is only equalled by its cowardice. Religion is all very well for women and children, because women and children are sheltered from many of the temptations that surround men. The cowardice of it all! Oh, my brothers, I believe that as a rule there are no greater moral cowards than most men. They have plenty of physical courage, but physical courage is one thing and moral courage is quite another. If a man hit you, you would hit him back; that is the courage of the bull-dog. There is a higher degree of pluck and courage that will make a man strike in the defence of the weak. A man, if he is worthy of the name of man, will go and stand by the side of the weak and deliver the weak from the strong; that is a higher kind of courage. And there is a courage that one often sees, thank God, amongst us Englishmen, of daring to risk one's own life to save the life of another; that is higher still. There is the courage of the soldier, who will, for the love of his country and for the sake of duty, go out and sacrifice his life. All these are rising from the lower to the higher, but they are all kinds of physical courage.

Moral courage is the courage that will make a man say "No" when he knows a thing to be wrong, and dare say "Yes" when he knows a thing to be right. I knew a man once at Oxford, a fine, athletic man, who was captain of his eleven, and I think that he rowed in the boats. After some great victory, either in the cricket field or on the river—I forget which—there was a supper given in honour of the triumph that was just achieved. After the supper was over, the rule was for each man round the table to sing a song. It went on very smoothly for some time, when a man got up and sang a filthy song. He had not reached the end of his first verse before a great stentorian voice was heard at the head of the table, "Stop that song, or I leave the room." There was silence for a minute; the man was cowed, and he sat down. My dear friends, put yourselves in the captain's place. Would you have said the same? You meet your comrades as you have just come from church, or you are going to church, and you have to pass the corner where all round are men just coming out, perhaps from the public-house, and as you come up, and the question comes with a sneer, "Are you going to church?" face the man, and say, "Yes, I am; you come along with me." Don't be ashamed of your religion. We want some pluck, we want some moral courage, amongst the men who do come to church, to bring in those who do not; and if they argue with you as to what is the use of doing this, and what is the use of doing that, and what good can you get by going there, answer them as Philip answered Nathaniel of old, not by argument, but by saying, "Come and see."

And then, once more let me say, perhaps here again is a fault on the part of us clergy. We have not put before our people sufficiently, perhaps, the beauty and the goodness of worship. There is a feeling amongst men generally when they come to church, that they come there for what they can get instead of coming for what they can give. Coming to hear a sermon is very well; coming to sing a hymn is all very well; but coming to worship God is far better, and a far more manful thing to do. And I tell you, my brothers, that this idea of worship is not really a difficult one. The idea of worship lies, I believe, as an instinct down in the depths of the human heart. The very essence of worship is what you can give, not in the first place what you can

get. You all show it when any of our Royal Family come by. If the Queen came by your village or your town to pay a visit in the neighbourhood, you would every-one go out—for what? Not for what you could get; not even to get a look from her, for she would not recognize you in the crowd. Why would you go? Because you are an Englishman, and because Englishmen love their Queen, and because wherever that Queen goes there will be found Englishmen to do her honour. She will not distinguish my voice amongst the crowd, but my voice shall join the others that rise to bid her welcome. That is the idea of worship. It is the entering into God's house with thanksgiving, and into His courts with praise. It is going into God's house, not for what I can get, but to give the Lord the honour due to His name. Is that a difficult thing? Who is the Lord that I should give Him honour? How can I love God if I know so little of Him? Well, begin by loving goodness; and you do admire good-ness. Evil is a thing that no man really loves. You may do evil, and in the doing of it you may enjoy perhaps a little spell of happiness as you feel some inclination of your lower nature; but you do not love it. If the man who has been convicted of some atrocious crime passes through your street, you may go out of your doors to look at him as a matter of idle curiosity; but if a man has done a noble and great deed, risking his own life to save his fellow, you would feel an inclination as he came along to go and shake him by the hand. You do not love the evil; but there is in the heart of man a natural bounding out to meet and admire that which is good.

My brothers, let us begin by loving goodness. Cultivate that as you would cultivate beauty in nature. You love beauty in nature. Why? Why are things in nature beautiful to you? Because they are beautiful to God. Then there must be something within me akin to something that is within God, and if I see a beautiful flower, I see a reflection really, and a picture of the eternal beauty above. And if I see goodness in a man, whatever the goodness is, and in whomsoever I find it, it is the reflection and the picture of God in that man. Begin by loving goodness, and you will end one day by loving God. And in that day we shall be like children who have been brought up to look at and admire the picture of One Whom they have never seen, and lo, when they are brought face to face with Him at Whose picture alone they have gazed, that face will be a thousand times more fair and more beautiful than the picture they looked at.

Alderman HARRY PHILLIPS, West Ham.

I AM very much obliged to the Bishop of Thetford for kindly clearing the ground. He and I are to take the same subject; and he has spoken from the standpoint, first of all, of why it is that working-men do not come to church. Now I want to re-cast that, and say why the working-men should come to church. I say "the working-men" because this is a working-men's meeting. I quite agree with his lordship that that applies to all men; and if we were to stand at any big central railway station to take a census of the men as they pour into the city in a morning, you would find among the first and second class passengers quite as many men who did not go to church as among the third class passengers. But to-night I want to talk to you as working-men. You are typical English working-men, bound to work, having worked, probably, to-day, and living an English working life in an English workman's home, and finding life very often a hard, monotonous, dull round. I will take you just as you are—typical, representative English workmen.

Now, why should you come to church on the Sunday? I remember saying to a docker once "I wish you would come up to our church (S. Luke's)", and he said the very thing that the Bishop of Thetford was speaking about. He said, "What shall I get?" I said, "If you come often enough, you will get out of that habit of being always 'on the get,' and get into the habit of giving." Who are the men to-day who are the inspiration of society? Who are the men who are fighting the social difficulties of society? Who are the men who are making life brighter and better round about them to-day? Who are they? Are they the men who are always "on the get" and always "on the make," or the men that are constantly giving something of their time, of their thought, of their influence for other men?

Take them in any organization you like, men. Take your friendly societies. Who are the men that are the backbone of those societies? Are they the men who join in order that they may get on the committee, and have an official position, and make something out of the branch? Take your trades union societies. Who are the men that are making trades unionism, in the highest and best sense, the power that it

ought to be in our land to-day? Are they the men who would simply join in order that they may get an extra "tanner" on every week's wages, and who would like to leave the union as soon as they got the extra "tanner," because they only joined in order that they might get something out of the organization? Those are not the men who are the salt of the movement. It is the man who says, "I think I shall go and join that movement because it will help that man who is down, and who is weaker than me." It is the man who is strong, and able, and skilful—the man that can command his price anywhere, and who joins the union in order that he may help the weaker man, with a wife and half-a-dozen youngsters, that would be driven to work at any price. The strong man says, "I am going to stand side by side with you, mate, and you are going to get what you are worth, and you are not going to be bought simply because you are hard up and poor." That is the principle that we want. It is the men who are permeated with that spirit—the spirit of giving rather than the spirit of getting.

Take it in municipal life. Who are the men that are making municipal life ideal to-day? Are they the men who enter in order that, indirectly, they may make a bit out of it some way or another, or the men who look at the slums, and the fever dens, and the bad property in the cities, and say, "This is a curse and a disgrace to us. Civic life in its best sense is not possible to the men who live there. I will give up my time in the evening that I may advocate their cause, and try to put into men's minds a willingness to pay a halfpenny in the pound on the rates for better buildings?" The men that are on the give are the men who are really and truly transforming, and uplifting, and elevating life to-day, so that if you are in the habit of using that phrase, "What shall I get?" I tell you that it will be one of the finest things for you if you simply come to get out of that habit of being "on the get," and get into the habit of being "on the give," because self-renunciation lies on the threshold of Christianity. It is the very doorstep for entering into Christianity. And then I mean not merely giving money. I do not mean merely that; not at all. I often wish that our clergy, when they say, "There is going to be an offertory to-night for such and such a thing," would say, "If there is any man here out of work, please do not let him think that we want him to give." Your first charge is your wife and children. If you have anything to spare after that, put it into the offertory box. Money is the cheapest thing to give, sometimes. It is infinitely easier to some men to give a shilling or a half-crown than it is to take a little trouble over something. But you working-men can give something that is invaluable. You can give some of your thought, some of your time, some of your influence, to that society which we call God's Church—our English Church, which is an organization second to none—and I am weighing my words over before I say them—second to none among the organizations for elevating and ennobling the lives of Englishmen and Englishwomen in our land to-day. I ask you to come to church, and to take part in the meetings of that organization, that society, so that you may add your quota, your influence, in order to make it more effective. You say, "Well, what can I do? I am not rich. I cannot give much, and I cannot speak." I will tell you one thing that you can do. You can shake hands. You can welcome the next stranger that comes into the church. I think that there is nothing more terrible than the way in which some men who are members of our congregations let strangers come and go, and never take any notice at all about them.

Some churches are perfect ice-houses. If a man joins a trades union, the moment the new member comes up, someone is there to take him by the hand, and say, "Glad to see you, old man." If he joins a friendly society, do you think that he would go to six meetings and nobody take any notice of him? Not a bit. If you working-men want to know what you can do, sit down at the end of the church next Sunday, and spot a stranger. Give him a bit of your hymn-book. When he goes out, say "Glad to see you. How do you like the service? Come again, old chap. Where do you live?" Make him feel there is something beautiful. It is almost blasphemy to talk about "Dearly beloved brethren," and to say "Our Father," side by side with the man who is sitting next to you, and perhaps come again and say "Our Father," without remembering that fatherhood implies brotherhood, and letting the man go away as if he was not a human being. Now, will you come and give us your time and influence in welcoming a stranger, and trying to make it home to him? I hope that the clergy here will not think that there is anything irreverent in shaking hands with a man at the porch of the church. Not a bit of it. Then another point. Try to take the thought in that you are coming to help on the work of an organization

which, I repeat, is doing splendid work in our country. If you do not think that it is, just read the "Church's Year Book." It is not quite so interesting as some of the books that you may be getting from the free library, or some of the books you buy; but it will do you good, because lots of men talk about things which they know very little about. If I wanted to criticise the work of the Social Democratic Federation, I ought, in fairness, to read their annual report. I heard of a workman sending his boy to get him some nutmegs. The boy brought some nutmegs, and there were six or seven Spanish nuts in with them. The father said, "Did the man give you these?" "Yes," said the boy. "I told you to get nutmegs. I will soon see about this." The father marched back to the shop in a passion, and said to the shopkeeper, "I sent for nutmegs, and I want nutmegs; and you have sent a lot of nuts." The shopkeeper said, "Very well. Don't be in such a temper. You take and weigh your nutmegs, and you will find that you have got your full weight. I put a few nuts in among them for your little chap." Weigh things over a bit before you are in such a hurry to criticise and find fault. Just turn over the leaves of our Church "Year Book," and talk to some Churchmen and try to understand—because you will not be able at first, for it will go beyond you—the enormous work which is going on up and down our land, in slum, and city, and village, and away down in the fish-market. See the enormous work that is being done. But I am not going to brag about the society, for I belong to it; I am here to contradict the assertion that there is nothing being done. If you come to the Church and take your share and part with it, you will be taking part in an organization which you need not be ashamed of or speak of with bated breath. It has, with all its faults, a glorious history, a marvellous history. It has put its hall-mark upon our English history. It gave you Government. It gave you education. It passed the Poor Law. And the men, too, that belong to it are heroes, leading noble lives, people ready to help any good work. When a man says to you, "What are you?" do not say, in a sort of half-apologetic tone, "Well, if I am anything, I suppose that I am a Churchman;" but when you are asked, "What are you?" say "I am a Churchman: what have you got to say against it?" Put it in a sort of defiant way, and you will be perfectly right in doing so, because you have nothing at all to be ashamed of. Then another thing, men. You can give—and believe, men, it is very valuable, and would be largely appreciated—you can give to your clergy your knowledge of your fellow working-men.

Do not think that I am here to apologise for clergymen at all; I am not taking up their brief; but I do want to speak fairly about them. I have had an opportunity during the last year or two of going to different parts of England and meeting with a large number of clergy, and finding out that they are honestly in earnest in trying to help working-men in their difficulties in their everyday life. They are honestly trying to do it. They are stretching out their hands; and very often there is not the response that there ought to be. You can come to the clergyman and say, "Look here, vicar, I will give you a tip or two how you can get hold of a few men." Do you think that the clergyman would say, "I do not want to know your tips. I am an M.A. I have graduated at Oxford or Cambridge?" He would be only too delighted. What a lot of waste of earnestness there is—what a lot of spent ammunition, of time and thought, that does not hit. I have read that when soldiers bombard a city in order to take it, some of the shot fall short. It is spent ammunition. It does not do its work at all. Now there are clergymen that honestly try to do good work among men; but somehow their efforts are spent ammunition. Life is too short for waste like that, and your knowledge of how to get hold of men might enable the clergyman's efforts to be more effective. I tell you that you would be honestly welcomed, and your advice would be readily accepted. Why, you could go and tell them, for one thing, that it would be rather wise if they would put on services at a time when you can go to them. Tell them that an eight o'clock celebration is almost an impossibility to the average workman.

My friend Mr. Ingram, of Oxford House, was chatting the matter over with the Bethnal Green men, and they said, "Put us on a service at five o'clock, before we go to work." He did so, and the result was that he had five hundred men in the church at Bethnal Green at five o'clock before breakfast. You might suggest to the clergy that they should also put on a type of services that you men could enter into. I do not know whether I am critising stupidly, but I think sometimes that our very respectable people who come to evensong might come a little earlier, and then clear out; and that then the clergy might put on a simple mission-service for working-men, and if there was a tune that you did not know, they would stop and say, "We will have a

tune that you do know." They would find out the type of service that would suit you. There are lots of ways, I am sure, in which you could help by giving your advice. Then by giving you would get. I mean this: in educating somebody else, you would get educated yourself. There is nothing like it. The more working-men come into touch with the rich men, or the men of higher social position, the better for them, and the better for both. I remember Tom Mann saying that he never had such an education as he had when he was on a certain commission. He had to meet men whom he thought were a bad lot, and he found out what decent men they were, and they found what a decent man he was. And then, you Christian working-men, show your principles. Show your colours. Men are not ashamed to show their colours when they belong to other societies. The Social Democrat is not ashamed to go to the meeting and show his principles. When he sees his companions standing at the street corner, does he blush to go into the meeting? Does the Independent Labour man blush to go to his society? Is the Agnostic ashamed to go to the Hall of Science in Clerkenwell? Those are his principles, and he does not look round the corner to see who is there and run in with a rush. Many of you men were baptized in our Church, and some of you were confirmed there, and most of you were married there, and a lot of you will be buried there. What have you to be ashamed of? The history of the Church? You have no need to be ashamed of that. If those are your principles, nail them to the mast and say, "I am going there to show my principles." In going to church you will get something. You will get what we want most of all. First of all, you will get an inspiration to lead a higher life, which, in our best moments, we all believe in. Sometimes a doctor says to a man who is run down, "Get a letter from someone if you can, and go to a convalescent home. The purer air that you would get there will bring you right again. You are not living in the right air just now." That is how it is that some men's souls get starved. They keep out of the atmosphere that would brace them up. If you come to church, the environment and the teaching help you to get stronger and better. We all long for it, every one of us. You are longing for it to-night. The tone of this meeting is a good one. It is lifting us up. You are looking back at some of the things that you are in the habit of doing, and you say, "That is not good for me. It drags me down. I wish I could conquer it."

I remember standing in front of some of the kennels where hunting dogs were kept. I was being shown round. We stood in front of that square room which is called a kennel, and the dogs came out of the little door. What a marvellous control the keeper had over them! One of them came out that he did not want, and he said, "Back, Spot," and he went into the kennel again. Then he called "Beauty," and Beauty came out. The whole of the dogs were under his control. I looked at the man, and I thought, "I would to God that I could keep my heart like that, so that when there is a bitter thought coming forward, I could say, 'Back, you are not to come out'; and when there is a filthy thought, 'Back, you are not coming out'; and that when there is a good thought I might let it come." We long for self-control in our highest and best moods. You can only get this inspiration by being connected with the power which is best fitted to help you to get it. You stand in front of a telephone, and you say, "Put me on with so-and-so; I want to talk with so-and-so." And then when you are put on you can speak to your friend who is a distance from you. Prayer, to me, is like a telephone, and I never have to wait to be put on. I can go to God, and I can talk to Him by prayer. I am connected, and I get an inspiration to a higher life. But you will also get what we need very much indeed, an inspiration to live out the life of a true social reformer. The majority of men here, I hope, are doing that. I cannot imagine that I am looking at a lot of butterfly men—men who are unemployed. I do not mean unemployed in daily work, but out of work for God. There are a lot like that. They never seem to be doing anything at all for God, or trying to make their fellow-men better. The men that are gathered here are not of that stamp. You are here to-night, looking, perhaps, upon some of those social difficulties and problems which face us. I have looked at them. It takes the heart out of us sometimes to look at them. I mean such things as drunkenness and gambling, and that awful habit that is creeping like a miasma over our working-men—men who have been splendid socialists, keen social reformers; men who have been good trade unionists, have become betting men, and they have lost all interest in social life, because there is nothing that makes men more selfish and more individualistic than betting and gambling. That is an evil that is spreading.

Then look at the low level living of some men, who seem to say, "As long as

I get enough to eat and drink, and a bit of baccy, what does it matter?" What a swinish way of living that is! How low down it is! You want to instruct those men, and bring them to a higher level.

And then look at the slush literature that is flooding us all over the land. Why, I saw the advertisement of an evening paper the other day with, "Outrage upon a girl. Full details. Sad case." That is the sort of thing that is being flaunted about and is always meeting you. Instead of being buried out of sight as it ought to be, it is flaunted about in the papers.

Then there are heaps of other things. There is the sweating, the cruel competition of companies, and the dishonest waste of time of some of your fellow-workmen, which makes your trade union to have a stain upon it. Look at all these things—the gin palace, the fever den, and the Sunday drinking club. There they are all before you. How are you going to deal with them? If you want to deal with them, you must be inspired again and again by the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ. I am not saying this out of any cant. I am speaking of this with an experience of nearly ten years' life in the East of London, and of going in and out amongst the men. I have seen men start with tremendous enthusiasm on mere material and utilitarian grounds, and they have got weary and tired of well-doing. We want to be constantly recharged in order to keep up our strength in these things. "They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength." That is the point.

Let us renew our strength, and we shall not get weary. Believe me, men. It is not hopeless. All these social problems round about us are not hopeless. Half of them are brought about by ourselves. A man said to me, "I do not believe in God when I look at the sorrows and the sufferings of the people." I said, "First of all, subtract how many sorrows and sufferings are caused by themselves, and then we will begin to talk about how much God does of it." Then I want to say this. Do not go away and say "Here they are, and there always have been these things. We cannot get away from them." It is not hopeless. I remember, not very long ago, a man fell down by one of my shops. There is a doctor living next door to the shop. The man fell down ill. A crowd gathered round, and someone went for the policeman. The doctor was fetched, and when he came he said, "I can do nothing for him, poor fellow; he is dying." There the man was lying down, just on the doorstep. Somebody said, "Well, take him into the passage and let him die quietly. We do not want a crowd staring at him. Cannot you do something for him?" "No," said the doctor, "nothing at all." In five minutes the man had ebbed out his life. It was a case of almost starvation. He was empty inside, and thoroughly broken down, and there the man died, just inside the passage of the doctor. What pained me most in this matter was the utter hopelessness of the case. They could not do anything for the man. I look at social death, and see men out of whom is dying the fatherhood and the brotherhood and the husbandhood. They seem to be dead of the best part of life. But their case is not hopeless. No man dares to say to me, "You cannot help that man." God says, "Greater works than this shall ye do." The Lazarus miracle shall take place over again. The resurrection of the widow's son at the gates of the city of Nain shall happen over again. "I believe in the resurrection of the dead;" and men who have been morally dead are living to-day clothed and in their right mind. Where did they get that inspiration from? They got it straight from God and from His Church. Do not think that these social problems cannot be dealt with. They can be dealt with, but they can only be dealt with successfully in the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, and if you come to Him for the Spirit He is willing to give it to you, and He will give it to you.

Now let us be practical. Will you make a resolution? Will you come next Sunday? Come to your church here. Come next Sunday to church, expecting to get help and blessing. God will not turn you away. Come believing that you will get it. Do not look for it too much in the sermon. You may get it. If so, that will be a bit of overweight for you. But look for it in the prayer, in the sacrament, in the Psalm, and in the Lessons that are read. Go away resolved that you will come next Sunday, working-man. And if you have got a wife bring her with you. It will be the finest thing in the world for you and your wife to come to church next Sunday. It is a long time since you came, but if you came you would get along together a good deal better than you have done for some years. Come to church next Sunday morning. Then have a funeral in the afternoon, and dig a deep grave and bury all your misunderstandings. Say, "Well, Mary, old girl, we have not been to church since the time that I put that ring on your hand. Let us have done with the past and begin again." And the wife will say, "Well, Jack, I have not been all that I ought

to have been to you; but let us start over again and determine that we will be happier than ever we have been before." This is not cant. This is possibility, real possibility.

Then self-resource—we want more teaching in that direction. It is not more wages that you want so much, or fresh paper on your room, and a new window here and there. There is a great deal in your heart, and in the heart of your wife, that would do much to make your home-life better. I believe in self-resource. You have got to be real. You have got to be your own *Chamberlain*, and you have got to make your own hearthstone a *Gladstone*. So then, men, my word for yours, these are the reasons for which I want you to come to church. Come, that you may get an inspiration to live a higher life, and go out fighting the battles of life manfully and bravely, and looking at life smilingly, that life may be more real to you and better, and that when death comes it shall not have any dread for you, and you will face it bravely, as if it were simply going into the next room, because you have been living near to God while you were here.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

IN about three minutes I am going to ask two members of the Working Men's Committee to propose a resolution. I have been asked to do so. During these three minutes I will say something which has occurred to me while these different speakers were addressing you on the subject of going to Church, and why men do not go to Church. My thoughts were carried back a good many years to an account of a meeting which I remember was addressed by Mr. Potter, a great man in those days, a strong advocate of trade unions and workmen's rights. A meeting something of this kind was held, and the question was broached, "Why do not the working men go to church"? That was the question twenty-five years ago, just as much as it is now. Yet I perfectly and entirely agree with what was said by the first speaker on this point, and do not at all think that the working men are greater delinquents in this aspect than anybody else. I think that the disease permeates all classes—the disease of stopping away from the worship of God. Mr. Potter listened to the different things that were said on that occasion. I remember one man said that it was the pew system; and another man said that it was poor sermons, and that the clergy did not preach as well as they used to preach. Another man said that it was the State Church—the connection between Church and State. And then it came to Mr. Potter to give his opinion, and he got up and said, "Well, what I have to say is this: there is a great deal, or at least there is something, in everything that has been said, about the pew rents, and about the inferior preaching, and about the Church and State, and so forth. I do not say that those causes may not operate, but they are only secondary causes. The real reason why working men do not come to church is not unbelief, and it is a great mistake to think that it is so; it is merely indifference. They stop away from Church because they do not care to come to church. They really have no interest in the matter, and so, because it does not interest them, they do not come to church." I remember quite well that that was what Mr. Potter said, and it was a downright good thing to say. And I expect that it is the same reason which keeps others away from church. I know that there are complaints among the clergy in London that many of the wealthier people do not come to church, and that they spend their Sunday afternoons at lawn tennis and croquet, and their evenings at dinner parties. There are complaints that church-going is on the decline, and I am afraid that it is so. It is indifference. In other words, to come to what has been put before you by the Bishop of Thetford, it is want of love to God. If people say to me, "Can you give any reason why people do not go to church?" I say, "Yes, certainly. I know perfectly well. It is because they do not love God." If people do not love God, of all the wretched dreary performances, I should think the Church Service must be the most dreary; because it is all about God. All the prayers are about God, and all the scripture is about God, and all the psalms and hymns are about God. If people do not care about God and do not love Him, I should think that Church Services must be the most wretched and the most dreary of all performances. I will ask you to bear that one thought in mind. I should like to make a long speech, but I am not going to do so. You have been kept here quite long

enough. Take that idea. You have had one or two hints how to acquire love to God. If you love God, you will love the church. David said, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord." He was glad to go into the house of the Lord because he loved God, and he loved the worship of God, and loved to pour out his confession of sin before God, and he loved the pardon and peace that he got from a gracious God. That is why David loved to go to Church—because he loved God; and all people who love God love the worship of God. I would recommend you just to take away that thought, and if you want to cultivate the love of God, I will give you three hints which I can give you in three sentences. First, always behave as you would behave if you did really love God; that is to say, try to avoid all sin. Sin is hateful to God. Try to do those things which you know are pleasing to God, and if you pursue that, by the mercy and grace of God, you will love Him more and more. Secondly—and I wonder that this has not been touched upon before, and I do not think that I should have spoken but for this—read your Bibles. Oh, my friends, the longer I live—and I am getting on in years now—the more I see the unspeakable preciousness of the blessed Word of God, which gives us the gospel of peace and salvation. I recommend [illegible] Read books of theology, reads books of devotion. Those are very well, but still they are no substitutes for God's blessed Bible. When I say to you, "Read the Bible," I do not mean just read a chapter or two like a chapter out of a book of travels, and then shut the book and think no more about it. I mean, "Read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it." Turn it over in your minds. Think about it. Meditate upon it, and pray about it. More especially, read the gospels, because there you will behold what I may call the photograph of our Lord Jesus Christ, and He is one who is "altogether lovely." The more you look at Him, the more you will love Him; the more you read about Jesus Christ, the more you will think about Jesus Christ; the more you study His life, His character, and His works, the more will you be drawn in love to our dear Saviour. If you love our Saviour, you love God; and if you love God, you will love to come to His house and worship our dear Lord and Master. I said three hints. My third hint is, try to cherish a spirit of thankfulness. Do not always be thinking about your troubles, and your worries, and your cares, and your offences, but sometimes turn to think of your mercies and your blessings. See how God has blessed you. I believe myself—and you know I am a man who has been all over the world, and lived in all parts of the world, and lived among the heathen—I believe that there are no people who are more favoured by God, if there are any who are so much favoured by God, as you and I. We live in the freest country of the world. We live in the greatest country of the world. We live in the country which of all countries of the world is, as I believe, the most blessed by the providence of God. Think how God has dealt with you in your past lives; how good He has been, how forbearing; how He has spared you again and again; and though you have sinned against Him again and again, again He has forgiven you, and spared you; and here you are to-night with salvation still before you. Try to cultivate the spirit of thankfulness to God, and then you will come to His house of prayer, and "ascribe unto the Lord the honour due unto His name." I told you that I was not going to made a speech. There are two gentlemen who wish to address you very briefly. They are members of your own class.

Mr. GOLDSMITH.

I APPEAR before you, with my friend Mr. Amies, as a representative of the Working Class Friendly Society, and the Working Men's Committee of this Congress. It was through the initiative of this Working Men's Committee that the subjects of this evening were placed upon the paper: "The Church and the Agricultural Labourer," "The Parochial Visitation of Men," and "Non-attendance of Men at Church." That is how it was really put. I just give this hint to the clergy, and this is from the working-men's point of view. I was speaking to a member of a working-men's society to which I belong, and he told me that he had lived in the parish for eleven years, and had only one visit from the clergy. If the clergy come to visit working-men, it is no use for them to come in the middle of the forenoon or the afternoon; it must be in the evening, when they are at home. If they will do that, they will get the men to attend church, and we shall see the men coming with their wives and families, not to have their ears tickled by a beautiful, eloquent sermon, but to worship

God in sincerity and in truth. We thank the Dean of Rochester, and Canon McCormick, and the Bishop of Thetford, and Alderman Phillips. We tender our thanks for the eloquent addresses which they have given us this evening.

Mr. FRANK AMIES.

I FEEL pleasure in seconding the proposition that has just been made by my friend, because, as a working-man, I wish to express the thanks of the working-men to the Lord Bishop and the clergy who have attended these Congress meetings. I feel quite sure that these Congress meetings have already done a great amount of good work at Norwich, and I do trust that the seed sown at this Congress will spring up and bear fruit. As a working-man, I know the necessity of working-men being brought into church, and I can only say that I am so pleased that this matter is being considered. It is the clergy that can lead the working-men to church. It is they [illegible] follow. If the clergy will come amongst them and bring them to church, they will come. I am looking forward to the time when the working-man shall be brought to attend and love his parish church. Then shall be brought to pass the words of our blessed Saviour, that His Church shall triumph over the world, and sin shall cease; and the Church of England shall flourish, and the great day will come when our branch of the Catholic Church, the Church of England, will stand triumphant by the side of Christ.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

Now let us, by way of thanking God, sing the Doxology. Then I will give the Benediction.

The Doxology was sung accordingly, and the Benediction was pronounced by his Lordship.

S. ANDREW'S HALL.

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 10TH, 1895.

The Right Worshipful the Mayor of Norwich (SIR PETER EADE) in the chair.

CHURCH MUSIC OF PURCELL'S PERIOD,

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS BY THE CHOIR OF NORWICH CATHEDRAL, AND A SMALL BAND CONDUCTED BY DR. BATES, ORGANIST OF NORWICH CATHEDRAL, DR. BENNETT PRESIDING AT THE ORGAN.

PAPER.

The Right Worshipful the CHAIRMAN.

IT is my duty as chairman of this evening, and I am very glad to think that it is my only duty, to introduce to you Dr. Armes, who is about to lecture to us. We are quite satisfied that the lecture will be most interesting and most agreeable to us all. We have only to remember that the man whose music is about to be illustrated before you this evening is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of English musical composers, and therefore, whatever is placed before us, will be of the highest description, and the music itself will be illustrated with the

highest art in the science of music. The name of Purcell is almost as familiar to us as the name of Handel, because he was competent to produce a great variety of styles of music, and I need not say to such an audience as this that he excelled in them all. With regard to the lecturer himself, his name is very well-known. Dr. Armes, of Durham, is a name so very well known in the musical world, that practically he requires no introduction by me. The fact that you have assembled here in such numbers to hear what he is going to say is sufficient evidence that you know his musical worth, and that you value everything he will say to us. To a Norwich audience, Dr. Armes is more especially welcome, for it was in Norwich, as I know, and other people know, that Dr. Armes began his musical career. He was connected with our Norwich Cathedral, and it was there he received the early part of his training. We are proud to think that that training contributed in some very material degree to raise him to that pitch of musical greatness which he now holds. The illustrations that we are to have will add very much to the charm of this lecture, and I am sure we are very much indebted to all those who have come forward to help to render them. I will now call upon Dr. Armes to give us his promised lecture.

PHILIP ARMES, Esq., M.A., Mus. D., Oxon.; F.R.C.O.; Hon. R.A.M.; Organist and Master of the Choristers of the Cathedral, and Senior Examiner in Music in the University, of Durham.

IT may be regarded as almost a truism, I think, that an art, like a self-imposed task or a friendship, abandoned for a time and then revived or resumed, is never quite the same in its second as in its first phase.

Whether we look to sculpture, to painting, to literature, or to the drama, we shall find this to be the case; and it is eminently true of the subject of the few words which I offer to-night, in response to the request made to me by the Committee, on "English Church Music of Purcell's Period."

This was as great in its way as was that of the period which preceded it, beginning with Thomas Tallis, and ending with the death, in 1625, of that prince of English contrapuntists, Orlando Gibbons. Yet it was different—different, in spite of connecting links which, though they seemed but slight, were stronger than they looked, because they were direct.

What were they? The lives and works of musicians who, being esteemed eminent in their profession before the troubles of the Civil War broke out in England, lived not only to see monarchy abolished and restored—and with the restoration of monarchy that of the elaborate choral service of the Church—but to be re-educated, as it were, in their art, firstly by the changed tastes of the period—changes mainly brought about by the personal leanings and likings of Charles the Second, whose long residence abroad had accustomed his ears to a lighter and more melodious style of music, instrumental as well as vocal, and to whom the graver style of the English Church music which his grandfather and father had listened to was distasteful—and, secondly, by the fine

examples of the later style of church music produced by the genius of Pelham Humfrey and of Henry Purcell.

Dr. William Child is an instance. Born in 1606, he lived till 1697, and his earlier writings are necessarily redolent of the solemn style of the musicians of the Tudor reigns, while his later ones could not fail to be influenced by the compositions of the two great masters I have named, both of whom he survived.

In the example of his work which I will now ask you to listen to, and which we must not confuse with his short setting of the same words, published in the second volume of Boyce's Collection, we shall find a happy blending of the ingenuity of imitative part-writing which was a great characteristic of the earlier school, and the declamatory force, the careful attention to the proper accents of words, and the increased importance of melody, *as* melody, which are among the great charms of the Purcellian period, which partly constitute the difference I began by alluding to, and which no observant, intelligent composer could fail to participate in, and be benefited by.

[The choir here gave, "O Lord, grant the king a long life."—*Child.*]

Another direct link connects these two great periods of Church music. Orlando Gibbons left a son who was an able musician, Dr. Christopher Gibbons, who had for a pupil John Blow, who was Henry Purcell's master.

So though the public performance of English Church music was prohibited; though the art of writing seemed stunned, as it were, it was not killed. Nay, more, it was quietly at work, biding its time, and shaping itself according to the changed state of things which the stirring events in England had brought about.

With the landing in England of Charles the Second, and with the consequent re-establishment of the Chapel Royal, all the subjects of my remarks must be connected. The links are now strong in every way, direct and collateral. Of the ten names which would have to be mentioned in a comprehensive list of the eminent composers of the period I am talking of, no less than seven would be given as "children," seven as "gentlemen," five as "organists," three as "masters of the children" of, and three as "composers" to the Chapel Royal.

S. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey may, between them, also claim eight of these ten names, but the Royal Chapel must be regarded as the nursery of modern English music. How did this come about? Somewhat in this way, I take it. The average musical life of a chorister boy may be put at about five years; the time, therefore, of the Cromwellian Protectorate was, in itself, more than sufficient to extinguish the race of singing-boys; and so, on the re-starting of the Royal Chapel, there were "searchings" to find lads who were known to possess musical ability. If it were not so we should hardly have found, by mere chance, three or four boys in the first "set" of children whose names have to this day remained among the accepted English composers, and a Purcell and others to follow immediately after them. To find men was no such difficulty. It needed no "searchings." They were ready to return to their former avocations whenever, if ever, their opportunity came.

This brings me to my second musical illustration. And here let me

say that I have thought it a better compliment to this Congress to avoid, as far as possible, instances which are in print, and therefore well-known to every student who desires to know them, and to dig my materials out of the mine of unpublished works by these great Church musicians.

Blow, Wise, Humfrey, and perhaps Turner, were among the first "set" of children. Blow's fine declamatory work in such anthems as "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," and "I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude," is so well-known as to absolve me from the necessity of attempting to throw any additional light on his talent, but it is not so in the other three cases, and I offer a specimen of each of them.

Michael Wise, who died in 1687 at the age of about thirty-nine, is notorious for the vein of pathos, tenderness, and gentle beauty which runs through all his works. In the instance you are about to hear, this "vein" is a very prominent feature. Its combination of voices—two trebles, an alto, and a bass—is also a peculiarity of his, and is not without its calculated effect; the softer, milder tone of the alto voice, as compared with the tenor, bringing into greater prominence the clearness of the treble voices, and increasing their proportionate strength. His imitative part-writing is splendid. This instance seems to me to be an admirable blending of the two schools of Church music: the earlier, contrapuntal one, and the later, melodial one; the results, in fact, of Wise's education and his inborn talent. It is interesting, too, as an early setting of those sublime words which Handel afterwards used so magnificently, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth."

[Wise's "Have pity upon me, O ye my friends" was sung by the choir at this stage.]

We now come to the work of a man who probably did more than any other to change the style of Church music in England. To Pelham Humfrey, who, dying at twenty-seven years of age, in 1674, wrote a large quantity of music, much of which has never been published, we are indebted for fine specimens of the art of musical declamation; compositions in which each change of sentiment in the words is met by a corresponding change in the rhythm and style of the music.

He uses, also, orchestral accompaniments in some cases as you will presently hear. His three years in France, under Lulli's guidance, had widened the scope of his ideas, and had probably made the mere organ accompaniment—or, rather, the organ duplication of the voice parts, for that is all that most of it came to—an insufficient medium for their conveyance. His vocal phrases, too, are of the boldest, his modulations happy, and his handling of the minor mode clever, though, to modern ears, somewhat crude.

His fine service in E minor, which it has been my good fortune to re-bring to a hearing in England, is a striking instance of these characteristics. I only regret that time will not permit me to offer any part of it to you to-night, and that it is still unpublished. As a justification of my assertion of his boldness, I would call your attention to the length of time he has dared to occupy in the phrase in my next illustration, "Praise Him in the sound of the trumpet," not less than fifteen bars on one chord only, and yet with its matter so varied as to convey any sense rather than that of weariness; in this respect quite anticipating Beethoven's daring in the matter of repetition.

"'Twas a very long sermon, Mr. Dean," I heard a young clergyman say to Dean Hook, when the Bishop of S. Andrews, Dr. Charles Wordsworth, had advocated the desirable union of the Churches. "'Twas so magnificent that I never thought of its length," was the reply.

[The choir now sang the Verse Anthem, with orchestral accompaniments, Humfrey's "O praise God in His holiness."]

This is one of several anthems to which nicknames were attached. There is one by Tompkins which is called in the old books, "The Roaring Anthem," for it contains a bass solo which includes the words "I have roared for the very disquietness of my heart," and the prominence given by its composer to the runs, or divisions, on the syllable "roar" gave the nickname to the anthem. Again, one of Purcell's was known as "the Bell anthem," because its opening symphony was built on a "Ground Bass" consisting of the descending diatonic major scale, and therefore suggested the "ringing round" of a peal of eight bells. In the old books from which I obtained this anthem of Humfrey's, it is named "The Anthem called the Trumpett."

[The choir at this stage sang "O praise God in his holiness."—*Humfrey.*]

Our next illustration is a very brief one, and as cheery as it is brief. It consists simply of two short sections and a *da capo*, or return to the first section, very slightly varied by way of finish. We will sing it without accompaniment. Dr. William Turner, its composer, who, born in 1651, lived to be nearly ninety years of age, had a very wide experience. Christ Church, Oxford, the Chapel Royal, Lincoln Cathedral, S. Paul's Cathedral, and Westminster Abbey all claimed him in the course of his life.

[The illustration here was Turner's "Lift up your heads."]

In approaching the name which is my *raison d'être* to-night, I am confronted with a task of such magnitude, on account of Purcell's vast musical abilities, and the many apparently exhaustive eulogies of him which have appeared from time to time, that it is a matter of real thankfulness on my part that I am only called on to speak of him in one of his capacities—that of a composer of Church music. Were this not so, time alone would have forbidden me to do more than glance at his many-sided talents, and the fruits they bore in the field of secular music.

I have no intention of wearying you with the dry facts and statistics of his short life, or of making any attempt at a chronology of his Church music from external evidence; the internal evidence is strong enough to guide us to general principles, from which we may make safe deductions. But two or three matters strike me forcibly in Purcell's case. Great man as he is in Church music, he is hardly permitted to be a pioneer. He was most fortunate in his teachers, but this very fact tells against his chances of leading art into new grooves. Henry Cooke, his first vocal master at the Chapel Royal, shows us, by the works which he has left us, that though he was no scientific musician—as a matter of fact he is quite unable to write without violating the grammatical rules of music—he was certainly a singer, and a man of taste, for his

vocal work is most expressive and effective for the voice. He uses the string band, too, though very crudely.

But in the matter of form his work is on precisely the same lines as that of his brilliant pupil, Humfrey, even down to such a peculiarity as the repetition, in the middle of a composition, of its opening symphony, or overture, the difference between them being wholly one of the quality of the music. Which of them taught this plan to the other, or whether they both took it from a common source, is a matter which can only be determined by the dates of the respective compositions, and we are hardly likely, I fear, to discover them. I dare not ask you to listen to another long anthem, lest you should say "*toujours perdrix*," but I should like to make good my assertion, and I will therefore ask the band to play the opening symphony only to "Captain" Cooke's anthem, "Put me not to rebuke, O Lord, in thine anger." You will soon see why I make the request. (The symphony was here played.)

Again, Humfrey, who followed Cooke as "master of the children," was eleven years Purcell's senior, and died when the latter was but sixteen, but he left splendid examples of the new departure in musical art; examples which Purcell, of course, must have heard performed as they came fresh from the pen of their gifted author.

Will the band play the opening symphony to Humfrey's anthem, "O praise the Lord, laud ye the name of the Lord," you will then be able to make the comparison between Cooke's and Humfrey's work which I hinted at. We must bear in mind that these opening and middle symphonies, with the ritornellos, are one of the great features of difference between the two schools of Church music. They form, in fact, one of the channels through which the French influence in instrumental music flowed to us. (The symphony was here played.) With Purcell's other master, Blow, the case is not quite so clear, for a reason which I should like to touch slightly on.

It is always somewhat dangerous, I know, to attempt a *simile*, lest it carry one's effort too far, and weaken its own force; but I have never been able, in Purcell's case, to avoid a couple of attempts in this line; comparing Humfrey and Purcell to Marlowe and Shakespeare; and, again, Blow and Purcell to Haydn and Mozart.

Marlowe, with his splendid tragic capabilities; his mastery of blank verse as a forcible means of dramatic expression; the crudity of his early work; and his rapid growth into comparatively finished art, as shown in "Edward II."; and Shakespeare, who possessed all Marlowe's gifts, and so many more, added to that greatest of all factors in his problem, a life which was spared till he had rounded off and finished its art-work. Just so Humfrey and Purcell.

Look, too, at Haydn and Mozart. The one, born twenty-four years before the other, and outliving him by eighteen years, writing charming but unpretentious string work. The younger genius taking his start in this line from this point; developing this beautiful art a hundredfold; and saying most gracefully that Haydn taught it to him. The older man then taking his new departure, based on the teaching of his great pupil, and doing splendidly elaborated work in consequence to the end of his career. Witness his later quartette and symphonies and the "Creation" and the "Seasons." So exactly, with Blow and Purcell. The one born ten years before the other, and out-living

him by thirteen years; teaching him, resigning the organist's place in the Abbey to him, and resuming it after his death. All my *simile* holds good here, and hence that want of clearness in the case that I alluded to; for though it might have been inferred that Blow's fine declamation showed Purcell how to do it, I suspect that it is the other way on, and that his best Church work was also learnt from his great pupil.

I spoke of ten great names which ought to be given; I have only treated of six. I therefore owe a sincere apology to the memory of those fine artists Benjamin Rogers, Jeremiah Clark, John Weldon, and, last and greatest of the four, second only in Church music, I take it, to Purcell himself, William Croft. They all flourished in Purcell's period, but my time is exhausted, and your patience too, I fear. I will end by giving two specimens of Purcell's work. It is almost impossible in these days, owing to the exhaustive four volumes of sacred music which Vincent Novello edited, to find any unpublished anthems by Purcell; but I should like you to listen to one of two which I have found—a very short, simple, and forcible specimen—and, last of all, to his great *Te Deum* in D, "for voices and instruments, made for S. Cecilia's Day, 1694," and published for his widow in 1697, two years after his death. This early example of a choral work laid out on extended lines, and accompanied by orchestral instruments, was, Dr. Burney tells us, performed annually at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, held in S. Paul's Cathedral, till Handel composed his *Te Deum* for the Peace of Utrecht in 1713, after which date the two works were used alternately till 1743, when the Dettingen *Te Deum* superseded them both. I hold in my hand a copy of the rare 1697 edition of both *Te Deum* and *Jubilate Deo*, with some short emendations in the handwriting of Mrs. Purcell.

[The choir rendered "Thy righteousness, O God, is very high," and, afterwards, "Te Deum laudamus."—*Purcell.*]

WILL you kindly permit me to fulfil the most pleasant part of my task. I should like before finally subsiding to thank most cordially the friends who have so ably assisted me with illustrations to-night. My thanks are due to my distinguished friend, Dr. Bates, without whose invaluable assistance in the arduous preparation of these works, I could not, and dare not, have shown myself here to-night; not less to my dear old friend and schoolfellow, Dr. Bunnett, for the most artistic way in which he has done his portion of the work, and to the gentlemen of the choir and of the orchestra, with whom, as an old chorister boy in this Cathedral, I must be in sympathy. And, though lastly, not least, sincerely believe me, I thank you for the most courteous patience with which you have listened to us.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. H. C. SHUTTLEWORTH, Rector of S. Nicholas Cole Abbey, E.C.; Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, London.

I SHALL not be so audacious as to enter upon the ground over which we have been so pleasantly led by the accomplished and scholarly musician who has just addressed the Congress. If the illustrations given by Dr. Bates and his assistants have afforded you anything like the rare pleasure they have given to myself, I shall do no more than

echo your own feeling in venturing to offer sincerest thanks both to the lecturer and those who have so ably and artistically interpreted his chosen selections. The question to which I shall address myself is a practical one. In one form or another it besets every working parson, often to his sore perplexity. It is this: "What room is there, in our parish churches, for music of the kind to which we have been listening? Is it an archaism, or a luxury, or merely interesting as a study? or is there still a place for it in our worship?" I do not pretend to do more than submit a few suggestions, based upon a tolerably wide experience of church music in cathedrals and in town and country churches.

I take it that the general principle of music in church may be expressed in the formula that it is at once a method of preaching and a mode of worship. As a method of preaching, music can touch and does touch the hearts of not a few who would listen unmoved to the most eloquent of sermons. There are types of mind and character, greatly on the increase in our day, which are intensely sensitive to such an appeal as is made to the heart by the best music. Persons of this kind may listen, critical and unmoved, to the most earnest missioner. But the pathos of Handel's "He was despised," or the mighty rush and flow of Mendelssohn's "Thanks be to God!" will stir them to the depths of their being. I do not, of course, mean to say that the impressions thus produced amount to what we call conversion. But, I believe that they do the work at which a mission preacher aims in the first place; they stir feeling, and waken aspiration, and render the soul susceptible, and quicken the sensibilities of conscience. Nor is it merely or chiefly the cultured to whom music thus appeals. Few influences go home more powerfully to the poor, and to those upon whom life lies heavily. Ask any singer whether he prefers an audience at the West End to a gathering of the workers and the poor. Nor is it reasonable to contend that the impressions thus produced are merely sensuous. Only the "æsthetic sensualist," against whose doctrine Puritanism is a righteous protest, can maintain such a position. Mr. Ruskin has shown, once for all, that art appeals far less to the senses than to the mind and spirit; and that its pleasures are intellectual and spiritual far more truly than sensuous. Sensual they can only be in the day of art's deepest degradation. (It is perhaps worth noticing in this connection, that real works of art seldom attract "superstitious" reverence. This kind of regard is not paid to the pictures of Fra Angelico, or the sculpture of Michael Angelo, but to black virgins of Chartres, and similar fetishes, which are certainly not works of art.)

My point is, then, that there are a large and increasing number of persons in our congregations who are more readily reached by music than from the pulpit; and that we shall surely be wise to recognize the fact, and provide for it.

As a mode of worship and prayer, music has long been recognized as a fitting vehicle of Christian praise. It is the speech of the spirit, the language of the soul, the voice of our unshaped and unspoken prayers. The melody of a hymn is often the expression of a spiritual emotion; a phrase from oratorio, or anthem, or symphony, calls up and utters that which we cannot say, but only dimly feel. So he who saw the Apocalypse found in music his highest symbol of the eternal praise of the blessed, in unbroken and unceasing harmony the nearest likeness of the activities and the rest of heaven.

In the practical endeavour to apply this central principle, the parish priest is wont to find one of his most perplexing and recurrent problems. There are two distinct theories of the place which music should hold in our worship—the artistic theory and the congregational theory. According to the first, the best music of the best composers should be rendered with the best possible resources, as a solemn act of adoration in the first place, and in the second, as a method of reaching the hearts of men.

This view of music in worship is provided for in the services of cathedrals and

of "places where they sing"; and though this latter phrase may originally have had reference mainly to collegiate churches, it may reasonably be urged that large parish churches, which partake of a quasi-cathedral character, and some other churches, where resources and circumstances admit, should be included in its scope and bearing.

Few will now be found to object to music of this type on the ascetic or Puritan ground. Even those to whom artistic music is of little help in their worship will mostly be content to avoid it for themselves without forbidding it to others. It has come to be generally recognized that the service of the English Church was meant to be a musical service * by those who compiled and revised the English office books, and the case against elaborate music in church will now be supported upon other grounds.

For there is a case against it, and a case of some force. If it be granted that the services of the Prayer-book were meant to be musical, they were also meant to be, above all things, congregational. And in cathedral services, as in elaborate music generally, the congregation cannot join. Indeed, if the music is to be rendered as perfectly as possible, the congregation *ought* not to join in it, since none but trained voices can do so with effect. Accordingly, it is urged that, except "in quires and places where they sing," music should be strictly congregational. Simple chants for the psalms and canticles, plain tunes for the hymns, and plain response throughout, are insisted upon. Anthems and cathedral "services" are banished; and in the endeavour to secure the co-operation of the congregation, the music is not seldom degraded by the use of flippant, catchy tunes which have no merit but that of a street song—namely, that everybody can sing it.

There are two classes of church which may be dismissed as involving little difficulty in regard to practical management. The church of the cathedral class will naturally adopt the artistic theory as its normal type, and the main question will be to what extent and in what manner the congregational method can be admitted and provided for. The little village church, unless in certain exceptionally musical districts, will inevitably and necessarily employ very simple music as a rule, although sometimes place may be found, when opportunity allows, for music of the other sort. The real difficulty begins when the church is not decisively of the cathedral or the village class; a difficulty which, in towns and in "mixed" localities, often becomes an abiding perplexity. A good choir is usually demanded, and can generally be got together. But while the people prefer such a choir, and take a pride in it which not seldom assumes somewhat grotesque aspects, they want also to join in the singing themselves, and they do not like it if they find themselves shut out.

On the other hand, the choir insist upon music which interests them, and they will not endure merely unison singing, or plain and simple services only. If they are paid, they go through the work in a perfunctory fashion; if unpaid, they do not care to come to the practices unless something more is to be rehearsed than ordinary chants and hymns.

There is much to be said on both sides. The ordinary member of an ordinary congregation may justly urge that he ought not to be defrauded of his right to take part in the service of the church simply because he is not a skilled musician. The trained singer, on the other hand, may fairly complain that his best efforts are completely spoiled by the man in the congregation who, with lungs of Bashan and the confidence of ignorance, persists in singing all through everything, regardless of

---

* It is not, of course, maintained that all services, on all occasions, were intended to be rendered with music.

tune, time, or pitch. The singer will also point out, with perfect truth, that unison singing of the usual type ruins the voice, unless carefully chosen and directed by a conductor of exceptional capacity and experience—a person not easy to discover, and one who, when discovered, will not be satisfied with unison music only.

The unfortunate parson (who has but too rarely cultivated his own musical capacity or properly trained his own voice) is at his wits' end to know how to reconcile the two conflicting theories thus exhibited by his choir and his congregation. If he is a bit of a musician himself, he will usually lean to the former side; if not, he probably takes the latter; or he goes to the other extreme, and drives out of church every human being with a cultivated musical ear by the horrors of his "congregational" singing.

More probably, however, he will endeavour to effect a compromise. He may seek to satisfy the choir by making over to them the performance of an occasional anthem, while maintaining great simplicity in the rest of the service. But even if he is lucky enough to buy off his Danes in this fashion, the difficulty is sure to come up again in a fresh place. For example, all modern hymnals contain tunes which are not at all adapted for congregational singing, which depend for their devotional no less than their musical effect upon just those delicate shades of rendering which are only possible to skilled singers, and are utterly ruined by the assistance of untrained voices. If these tunes are banished, the choir will assuredly resent it, and probably the congregation will be ungrateful enough to grumble. If they are retained, the choir will complain because they are spoiled by the singing of the congregation; or else the congregation will have feelings because their part in these hymns is discouraged.

Meanwhile, it may be pointed out that the "anthem" compromise is seldom entirely satisfactory. An anthem requires to be very excellently sung. The form in which this class of music is written demands great perfection of rendering; and an anthem badly sung is particularly distressing, not to trained musicians only, but to all who have any musical ear. In fact, it is scarcely too much to say that if anthems cannot be really beautifully sung, they had better not be attempted at all. Certainly they had better be sternly banished when their main object is to show off the "solo boy" or the amateur tenor. Moreover, as the choir improves in capacity, the less will its members be satisfied with the simpler sorts of anthem. They will want more advanced music, and more of it.

I myself believe that the best solution of the difficulty will be found in separating elaborate music altogether from the offices of the Church—though not from the choral Eucharist—and finding place for it at an entirely distinct service. Anthems will not be wanted, either by choir or congregation, if oratorios, or selections from them, can be given occasionally upon Sunday afternoons or after evensong, or upon a festival or a week-day evening. It will be possible then to get rid of the anthem and the cathedral "service;" and to adopt, for the most part, plain chants and congregational hymn-tunes. Those who do not appreciate elaborate music need not remain to, or come to, the special musical service. Care must, however, be taken to prevent the choir from giving no attention and little pains to the plainer music of the offices. They will soon discover, if competently trained, that it is not child's play to lead and guide the singing of a congregation, but that, on the contrary, it is a matter worthy of their most careful attention and effort.

A most imperative necessity for good congregational singing is careful training. It is absurd to contend that people can sing, even roughly, by the light of nature. They can no more sing than they can paint or draw without being taught. We must teach our congregations to sing if we want good congregational music. And this is a far less difficult task now than it was in former days. Everyone must needs notice the increasing number of people who now study music, the much more systematic teaching

given in the great musical institutions, and the importance assigned to the subject in elementary schools. Thus in most congregations there is not only a good deal of latent musical capacity, but a fair number of persons who have received a certain musical training. Much of this ability, which would be of the greatest help in the service of the sanctuary, is now allowed to run to waste, especially in respect of women's voices. Whatever objections may be entertained in some quarters to the employment of women in our choirs, cannot be maintained against their being taught to sing with effect in the congregation.

It follows that a congregational practice is as indispensable as a choir practice. It may be conducted upon a Sunday evening, once or twice a month, after evensong, members of the choir, or of the local choral society, being judiciously dispersed about the Church to lead the voices.

The defects of congregational singing, such as faults of time and tune, can only be obviated by this systematic practice, and by gradually teaching the people to sing from note. It will thus be possible to get Tallis's responses sung as the composer intended, the congregation joining in the part written as the tenor, or *canto ferme*, and not attempting to sing the treble, which is a mere ornamental accompaniment, like the *faux bourdons* of certain quasi-Gregorian chants. But it must always be remembered that, although "dragging" is one of the worst of faults, a congregation can never sing so rapidly as a trained choir. All hymn-singing of the congregational type loses more than it gains by the unseemly and irreverent hurry-scurry, too common amongst us, which renders words of deep contemplation or worship like a flippant popular song. Congregational singing must be generally in slow time; for people cannot recite the words of the psalms rapidly, or sing rapid passages in unison.

I would only, as has been hinted, admit anthems, and cathedral "services" for the canticles, as makeshifts and temporary expedients in ordinary parish churches; and I would discard them altogether as soon as oratorios, cantatas, and services of praise were practicable. The work of the choir would be found in these, and in giving to the Holy Eucharist its due setting of musical beauty and dignity. The hymn tunes which have been called "choir part-songs" will also demand their care, and a trained congregation will soon learn when to sing and when to hold their tongues.

Practical musicians will be agreed that a choir which should undertake the work I have indicated must have the aid of women's voices. Boy altos are inefficient; men altos are rare, and seldom satisfactory. Boy trebles have a certain freshness and purity of tone, but they are necessarily immature, both physically and otherwise, and so are unequal to the full expression of profound spiritual thought or feeling. Moreover, even when daily trained in a choir school, boy trebles lack body and fulness of tone in chorus; they are of necessity thin and inadequate by themselves, though valuable in blending with and assisting the natural soprano voices of women. The practical difficulty is found, of course, in the general custom of the Church, which is against seating women in the choir-stalls, though not against the employment of their voices elsewhere. There is, indeed, no solid reason why there should be any choir-stalls at all, except for the clergy. The old west gallery position of the choir, though perhaps less pretty to look at, is, in fact, much more convenient from a musical point of view than the cathedral arrangement which the older High Churchmen imitated. The stalls may well be reserved for the clergy and their attendants, and the choir restored once more to their old place, where that is possible. At any rate, it may surely be admitted that no important principle is bound up with a surpliced choir, and that a good woman is at least as worthy to lead God's praises as a good boy.

Reverence and decorum can be as readily maintained in the west gallery as in the stalls, and the singing in the congregation is from thence more effectively promoted

and led. As for the objection that a mixed choir leads to undesirable flirtations, and to a general lowering of tone, I have only to say that I attach no importance to it. I have myself directed such a choir for some years; and my experience is that women-choristers are far more efficient, far more reverent and devout, and cost far less trouble, than any cathedral or church boys I have ever had to do with. Nor have I ever had to regret such a "lowering" of tone as we are sometimes assured must be inevitable. The facts tell in precisely the contrary direction. Choral societies find no difficulties of this sort; why need church choirs?

I have left myself no time to speak of the place which instrumental music should, in my judgment, be assigned in the Church. I will only say that I think we never did a worse day's work than when we abolished the old village band, which some of us remember in our boyhood. Like the Church itself, the band needed reform, not disestablishment. Our aim should now be, to bring back the help of "strings and pipe" to the service of the sanctuary.

Let me conclude with the famous saying of Luther—"After theology, there is no art to be compared to music. For she alone, after theology, causes . . . a glad and quiet heart. Therefore the devil, author of sad cares and of crowds of disquiets, flies at the voice of music as he flies at the word of theology."

ASSEMBLY ROOM.

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 10TH, 1895.

Mrs. SHEEPSHANKS in the Chair.

WORKING WOMEN'S MEETING.

WOMEN'S DUTIES.

(1) AT HOME.

(2) AT BUSINESS.

(3) TO THEIR COMPANIONS.

ADDRESSES.

Mrs. SHEEPSHANKS, The Palace, Norwich.

I HAVE to announce that Mrs. Evered Poole, who was to have spoken on Women's Duties at Home, is unable to be present on account of indisposition, and I have undertaken to do the best I can in her place. I shall address myself to those women who, by the Providence of God, are called to be wives and mothers. It is not from any want of interest or affection for the young people that I do not address my remarks to them, but because there is not time, and also because the two next speakers will do so. The main idea I want to put before you will be that our duty as women at home is that of remembering our responsibility. I am quite sure that is a duty we do not sufficiently grasp—I begin with our duty as wives. I speak to you as a wife and as a mother myself, therefore we meet on one common platform, and in the one common bond of womanhood. You and I alike are called to discharge our duty, to remember our responsibility as wives and mothers. You may begin married life as I did, at an early age. Some begin quite as young girls, but we must never forget that when we enter the married state we undertake a great and life-long responsibility. The happiness of the home must to a very great extent

depend upon the wife. The wife is always at home, she is the one who has to supply the softening influence. Woman's nature is intended to be, and generally is, of a softer and a more pliable nature than that of man. I wish to try and put before you the ideal of what a wife should be, that you may aim at it. I do not say we all succeed, and you must not think it is because I think I have succeeded; but I put before you what we ought to aim at in our responsibility as wives. And this life can be lived just as well in the house of the working-man as in the house of the rich. It is not a life that is as much affected as one would think by outward circumstances; the trials and duties may vary, of course. I dare say mine are different to yours in many ways; but we have the same broad lines of duty to follow in our relations to our husband and children.

What is our duty, then, towards the husband? He is the head of the home; he is, or ought to be, the bread-winner; and this must be kept carefully in mind. We are, perhaps, sometimes inclined to think that our opinion is on some points as good as, if not better, than his. But we must realize that our position and duty as wives, if there is any clashing of opinions—(I am not speaking of matters where it is a question of right and wrong, I am speaking of ordinary matters)—is to remember that the wife's duty, and her responsible position as a wife, must lead her to yield her wishes to the wishes of her husband. There must be one to decide the questions which arise from time to time in every house. It may be the choice of a school, or of a trade for your boy—there may be a division of opinion as to the school or trade to be chosen. Who is to decide? It is here that the responsibility of the wife comes in. She finds the answer in the teaching of God's Word—"Wives submit yourselves to your own husbands as unto the Lord." We do not always like these ideas; but where there is mutual love, where marriage has been entered into from right motives, where the love of God is in the heart of both parents, there is no difficulty or clashing—it merges into mutual yielding through love, not submission in any slavish sense, but the yielding of a loving disposition.

I would say next, that it will be most useful for us to consider our province and responsibility in making the home happy to husband and to children. The interior life of the home rests, and must rest, upon the centre of home life—the mother; for it is she who regulates the home, who manages the children, she to whom husband and children should turn for sympathy in their troubles, encouragement in their work, and one who is ever ready to enter into their pleasures. There are, alas! many homes amongst both rich and poor where the circumstances make it well-nigh impossible for the wife to be this centre of brightness and happiness. I have in my mind homes where it would have been a mockery of the poor woman—not knowing where to find bread for her children or money for the rent, dreading the return of him who ought to have been her support and comfort. But my words are not to those thus suffering. I do not fancy such are here before me.

What means are the most likely to secure the brightness and happiness of the home? First of all must come the habit of always seeking the guidance of our Heavenly Father, to ask in the morning for grace to discharge our duties, in the evening to thank Him for mercies and ask for forgiveness for our failures. We cannot be happy ourselves, therefore we cannot make others happy, unless we are strengthened by the power of religion. Disappointments will come; life won't look always so rosy; so we must lay in a stock of prayerful habits and good resolutions for the duller days which will come. I should like to say more on our making use regularly of the helps of public worship and other means of grace, but must for want of time pass on to some homely matters of detail. I should place great stress on having method in all we do, for I am quite sure that orderly habits are absolutely necessary for comfort; and without comfort the homes are not very likely to be bright and happy. The young wife who begins married life by thinking it does not matter what time she gets up, when she tidies up her kitchen, or does her washing, is only too likely, when the babies appear, to drift into the reckless habits which so often prevent the husband finding any comfort or quiet when he comes in from his day's work.

I like to recall the home of some working people I knew in my earlier married life, at which I was calling in the late afternoon. I can see the spotless floor, the little round table with a clean white cloth, the grate shining, and the glitter of the steel rests outside the oven. The wife herself was as attractive as any lady in evening dress, in her black dress and pretty apron. I said to her, "What a comfortable home for your husband to come to," and she replied, "I think it is the least I can do for him; he is out all day, so I always contrive that the two children shall be ready for bed when he comes in, and when he has seen them, all is quiet for his supper."

She had hit upon and carried out the right idea of method. It is not easy, in fact it is not always possible, for the mother with many little ones (perhaps a fractious baby) to carry out the rule of a fixed time for doing everything, but she can set it before her, and is much more likely to succeed in making home happy and attractive to her husband than if she gives in to the difficulties. Besides neatness and order in the house, do not neglect your own appearance. Take a pride in making the best of yourself. The shabby, well-worn dress, if clean and carefully put on, the neat shining hair, will all show that pains have been taken to please the husband's eye. Believe me, you will be well repaid for the effort it may need.

I have told you of one out of not a few homes I knew well where this was done; I will tell you of one where a good woman, an affectionate wife and mother, never acquired this habit. I often went to see her, for she was one of my mothers' meeting, but I never once found a chair which had not to be cleared, or when unwashed cups were not standing on either dresser or table. Difference of wage, I used to notice, was not the reason of one home being so different to others; it was the habit of order and method, of attending to home duties instead of standing about at the open door, or running in and out of the neighbours' houses.

Another very valuable lesson we must all learn, is to keep a control over temper and tongue, to refrain from the bitter word and taunt that spring but too readily to the lips of the weary woman. Bitter words and violent temper are often as ruinous in their results as grosser sins. The habit of self-control cannot begin too soon, or last too long. Gentleness will, in the end, often soften and win the roughest temper.

Let me turn now to our responsibility as mothers; a responsibility we must not shrink from, which we should pray we may realize deeply more and more. When we hold the helpless infant in our arms there is nothing in that appealing helplessness to make us wish to hand over our sweet responsibility to others. I have often admired the wonderful way in which the hard-working mother will go on day after day doing her household work and caring unweariedly for the restless, sickly baby, night and day, not only uncomplainingly, but with absolute love and patience. This patience is somewhat more tried when the infant becomes a restless, active child, capable at an early age of being troublesome. Now I want to beg you very earnestly not to be too ready to pack off the troublesome youngster to school, merely to get rid of the bother; nor to think if you send your boys or girls to school you have nothing more to do with their bringing up. You brought them into the world; you will have to give an account for them; the hours of school only form a small part of their training. You must teach your girls habits of order, of thrift, of modesty; you must teach them to learn self-control in their early years. Don't, because it saves you trouble, leave them to go their own way; warn them against the dangers which only too soon are ready for them. Don't be hard upon them or vexed because they don't think as you do—let them feel sure of your sympathy and love.

And what I say of your duty to your daughters, I would say of your duty to your sons. If they see in their mother a pure-minded, praying woman, if they have learnt from her to pray, to value the teaching of Sunday school, to worship on the Lord's Day as a duty as well as a privilege, as years go by, and they pass from the mother into the world, they will take with them blessed habits which will stand them in good stead when tempted to the vices either of intemperance, impurity, or the like. We may, alas! see our sons and daughters wander away in spite of prayers and teachings; but if we have done our best the day may surely come, though perhaps not in our life, when the poor wanderer is led back, thanks to his remembrance of the gentle, loving mother whose teachings he neglected when she was alive. Can you think of a more delightful moment than that at the last great day, when we may say with humble thankfulness, "Of those which Thou gavest me, I have lost none." To fulfil rightly these different duties, to act up to our responsibilities, is not easy. We can't do them by the light of nature, any more than we can do any work without learning. But we have a patient Master, Who is ready to teach, ready to help us, and supply us with knowledge and strength if we will ask Him. He sustains us in our trials, when our dear children are taken by Him from our longing hearts; He desires to draw us nearer to Him through them, and encourage us to try more earnestly to join them in His presence. The work is great, sometimes disheartening; but let us look upwards, and let us pray much for our husbands, our children, and for ourselves, that we may realize more and more the great duty, the great responsibility that has been placed in our hands, and the account which will be required.

Before ending this simple address, I should like to say to the younger women, the daughters, how much you can lighten the life of your mother by showing her love as

well as obedience. Young people do not know how parents value the spontaneous love and care of the children; how they value the simple little ways—the bringing of a cup of tea, the placing a footstool. Any such little token of attention seems by its evidence of love to lighten the weariness and cheer the spirits. Surely, then, you will try and look for the many ways in which you can help your mother and brighten her life. She won't ask you, because she wants you to have as few cares and as much pleasure as she can give you; but being a mother myself, with both grown up and little children, I know what a difference it makes if, when I feel tired or out of spirits, the door opens and a voice says, "Oh mother, how tired you look! Can I get you anything?" or brings something without asking. Why, half the fatigue goes with the sympathy and cheering effects of being cared for. Practise, then, whilst you have time, habits of thoughtful care for your father and mother; do your part in making home pleasant to brothers and sisters, as well as to those to whom you owe your first duty. For I can assure you you are very important in the home kingdom, adding greatly to its happiness by your goodness, brightness, and love; or, alas! increasing, oh, so terribly, the cares of your parents if they see you wilful, giddy, and cold to them. Practise yourselves in prayer, learn to read your Bibles, and keep Sunday—so doing you will prepare yourselves to be good wives and mothers in your turn.

(2) In Business.

Miss Blanche Pigott, Sheringham, Cromer.

"Mary sat still in the house." We know the story well. Had she not sat at the feet of Jesus and heard His words? Had not her soul expanded in the light of His countenance? Surely so. No one could sit at the feet of the "Strong Son of God," the Saviour of the world, without being inspired with a great ideal, a longing at His bidding and in His strength to go forth to help and bless. No one could sit at the feet of the Man of Sorrows without having their hearts filled with a mighty sympathy and longing to help the suffering, sinful world.

But it is all over now, Lazarus is dead, hopelessly dead; the Christ has not come. She is disappointed and cast down. "Mary sat still in the house." What does it matter now? All things are hopelessly wrong, and she cannot right them. My sisters, is it so with us? Are we sitting still thus powerless and discouraged? I suppose most of us have had times when we longed to make the world better and brighter; when for a time we have sat at the feet of Jesus, and taken a wide outlook into the world and life; but now it is different, we have given up trying much. What does it matter what we do or are, Lazarus is dead! Enough if we get through life, do our daily task, and, as we say, do nobody any harm. But Lazarus is dead, and Jesus lives, and, as of old, is drawing nigh. He comes to rouse us out of our listless discouragement. "The Master has come, and calleth for thee."

I have been asked, my sisters, to speak of the duties of women in business. I know it is printed, "Duties of Women to their Employers." This is not my subject; but to that I would say, "One is your Master, even Christ." Be true to Him in all your thoughts and ways, and your earthly masters will find it is a blessed thing to have such employees. If both employer and employed would act as servants of Christ in their dealings with one another, we should hear less of trade disputes, and discomfort, and ill-will; but the subject on which I was asked to speak is the duty of women in business.

I suppose our duties are—to help one another in every possible way, and at every possible time; to roll the stones away, and to loose them, and let them go. Have we given it up in dull, listless discouragement? Are we sitting still in the house of our own small interests, our hearts and sympathies narrowed and dried up? Or have we heard His voice, and risen up and come to Jesus? Surely this great Church Congress—where men and women have met from all parts of the country to describe the best way to help to make the world better—is, as it were, a fresh call to everyone of us to rise and work. The Master has come, and calleth for thee; and by His grace we shall roll away the stones that are shutting men and women from the vision of the Christ, and unloose the grave-clothes that are hindering them standing and walking as living men and women should. Put away discouragement; arise, He calleth thee. Only believe, and all things are possible to him that believeth. Only believe, and thou, too, shalt see the glory of God. Dead Lazarus shall rise and sit at meat

with Jesus; but we must roll away the stones, and loose him, and let him go; and it will not be by sitting still in the house and accepting things as they come, but by going forth to meet the Christ, and do His bidding. Is there no one at this moment you can think of who sorely needs your help; no one to whom you might bring new life and help; no fellow-worker whom you might make happier; no assistant you might make things easier for? How much one person can do either to raise or debase the tone of their fellow-workers! It was said of the second Napoleon that he had the baneful power of lowering for a time the intellectual power of those who were with him, so that no one in his presence could appear truly great.

Surely in this a forewoman of a factory or house of business has a mighty trust from God! What a power such a one has either to make or mar the lives of those under or younger than herself! It is wonderful what a bright word or smile can do, or a kind "Good-morning."

One day I went into a large shop in London, where I was a stranger. Noticing a girl looking very pale and sad, I suppose I smiled at her. As she passed by quickly with something for a customer, she said, "It's my birthday to-day; but I can't stop." I waited a little, and she came back and said, "I am twenty-one to-day. I had so looked forward to to-day at home in the country; but I am here all alone." "Many happy returns of the day," I said. "Oh, thank you; I feel so much better now; but I must not stop, good-bye."

Don't let us ever think lightly of the little courtesies of life, or let ourselves grow gruff and rusty. Let them that love thee be as the sun. We have a mighty power. Some of you here are mistresses; some of you are forewomen in the works; how much you can do by a kind word to those who are younger and weaker than yourselves! There is nothing like courtesy and gentleness to win others. I remember hearing of a very bad boy in New York. He went to one school after another. He was utterly hopeless, and did nothing but upset the classes. At last he was sent to a school where there was a young teacher, and there he became perfectly changed. Someone asked him how it was he had given up his rough ways, and he said, "Do not you know we have got the politest teacher in New York?" I am sure that courtesy makes a wonderful difference in life; and those who profess to be Christians and are members of our Church may, with advantage in their place of business, show that their Christianity has power enough to give them a gentle voice and a kindly look. Then there are other definite stones we can roll away.

I believe you have a flourishing Co-operative Society in Norwich. It were well if all women threw themselves into this movement, which is doing so much to add to the happiness and well-doing of workers. The Women's Co-operative Guild is doing a great work in many parts of England, giving many women a wider outlook in life. Taking part in the lives of others, they can make their own lives happier and wider. By becoming a member of a store, always buying from it, and taking an active interest in its working, you will be, without any extra effort, laying by for yourselves. If a person spends 10s. a week in a store, where, as is usual, the dividend is 2s. in the £1, at the end of ten years you could have £32 10s.; at the end of thirty years £175 6s. 9d. The Rochdale system, which was started by twenty-eight weavers at Rochdale in 1842, each subscribing £1, buying goods at wholesale prices and selling them at retail, no credit being allowed, has now, besides the central store, twenty-five branches, with 11,884 members. Other societies of the same sort have been started all over England, with about 1,000,000 members. The profits, more than £3,000,000, are divided amongst the members, sums being put aside for education, charity, and propaganda. For each £1 subscribed, 5 per cent., *i.e.*, 1s. a year is given. Every member that is a holder of a £1 share has profits according to what he has bought; a tally is given for each purchase, and at the end of the quarter, on their production, the sum is paid over to the holder. Not only does this answer the purpose of a savings bank, but it prevents a woman getting into debt. It has been said with truth, "The credit system of this country is only second in its demoralizing effects to the drinking customs of the people."

The co-operator does not undersell the other shops. He buys a good article wholesale, and sells it retail at the current price; but all the profits go, not to others, but to himself and fellow co-operators. Surely we ought to do all we can to influence women to join. I have heard of one woman, who has for years been a co-operator and reaped the benefit, who, as her children marry, gives them as a wedding present a £1 share in a co-operative store. We need more united action amongst women—more combination. All sorts of abuses are apt to creep into factories and workshops, where crowds of unorganized, timid women work, and Acts made for their protection

are a dead letter. One individual dare not appeal against these abuses; but if all were united, it would be comparatively easy. Thoughtful women ought to make themselves acquainted with the Factory and Workshops Act, the Truck Act, the Shop Hours Act, and the Employers' Liability Act. We have no right quietly to sit down under abuses which can be remedied. These are some of the stones which we, in God's strength, must do our best to roll away; and to do this we must be united. But, above all, let us see to it that our own standard is never moved, and let us steadfastly set our faces to do all we can to help and uplift others.

And what about the drink, my sisters? There is something appalling in the statistics showing the terrible increase of drink amongst women. Eight thousand three hundred and seventy-three women taken up as drunk and disorderly in London in one year! Someone counted seventeen young girls pass the worse for drink as they stood for twenty minutes on a bridge at Bristol. And what about Norwich? Oh, the lives that each one of us can remember being wrecked by this terrible cause.

My sisters, these things ought not so to be. Cannot we do more in the cause of temperance; cannot you influence those with whom you work to join a temperance association. In this matter not one of us can live or die to herself; we are forming the habits of those around us. Fling the fetters of evil customs, the bondage of self, aside, and destroy not with your light and knowledge the souls for whom Jesus died; but for all this we must ourselves have risen and gone to Jesus. Who dares to roll the stone away from the dead without the living Christ to bid him come forth and live? What do we each one of us know or think of Christ? We alone cannot comfort or save, but

> "Man's weakness leaning on the Lord,
> Its end can never miss."

Let us go to Him, and from the depths of our hearts let us cry, "Lord, what wouldst Thou have me to do?" The answer will come in different ways to each one. Perhaps it may be, as Carlyle once said to a lady who asked him what she could do to make life more worth living, "Find out some poor lassie, and be good to her." And do let us do all we can to cheer one another along. The world is very sad and very tired, and it is wonderful what little things can comfort. If we are looking out for opportunities to serve, God will send us on His messages. I remember hearing about a terrible fire in one of our great cities. A fireman had rushed up again and again to rescue the inmates from a burning house, but now the fire had gained a fearful hold, and the brave man's heart began to fail as he saw the fierce waves of flame beating round the ladder. A little, terrified child was wailing at the topmost window. He mounted the ladder, but the flames baffled him. He paused, looked up, and shrank back. The crowd stood silent—the little one must die! The man's heart was failing. Someone in the crowd said, "Cheer him," and a tremendous cheer burst forth. The man dashed up the ladder, and caught the little one in his arms as the cheers again rang forth. Oh, "the best and the wisest amongst us have need of hearty encouragement here." Never say of a girl or a woman, "I never did think she would stand." I daresay she would have stood if you had not helped to push her down. God grant that everyone of us may always have a bright cheer for our brothers and sisters. As I have said, the best and wisest amongst us have need of encouragement, and may God help us to be His messengers of the brightest joy and peace in this sad world, for Christ's sake.

---

(3) To their Companions.

Mrs. Creighton, The Palace, Peterborough.

Perhaps you have sometimes discussed the difference between men's and women's work, you may have attended Women's Rights meetings, or have thought over the differences between men and women, and have wondered what was the share of each in the work of the world; what women ought to do, and what men ought to do. We shall, I think, find the best answer to this question if we look in the Bible, where we are told that God saw that it was not good for man to be alone. And what did God do? He did not make another man to be his companion, but he gave him a woman to be his helpmeet. If women were to do just the same work as men in the world, and be just like men, why should God have taken the trouble to make women at all? But I am sure that you will agree with me that there is different

work for men and women to do in the world, and that men and women can help each other through life, and be companions in work as well as in play. Men have not always remembered that women were given them to be their companions. Often in the past they have treated them as slaves.

In Africa, at this day, a man takes a wife that she may work for him, and if he gets a new piece of land he marries a new wife to till it. In most heathen countries women are nothing but the slaves of men. In Mahommedan countries they are treated as the slaves of men's pleasure. They are not even allowed to work, but are shut up in harems and kept away from the world, with nothing to do save to quarrel with one another. Christianity taught men the true position of women. Look how our dear Lord treated women. He did not give them the same work as He gave men; He did not make them Apostles, but they were fellow ministers with Him. He made women His companions, and let them be with Him wherever He went. But though Christianity taught men how women should be treated, there are still men who treat their wives as slaves.

For do we not find, even in England, women who have to work for their drunken, lazy husbands; men who take their wives' earnings and waste them. Sometimes it is partly through the wife's fault that a man slips into lazy habits. To avoid what they consider the monotony of home, some women continue at the factory after marriage, and their husbands are gradually led to rely on their earnings. I think the man ought to be the breadwinner, and the woman the homekeeper. It is the woman's business to spend faithfully for the good of the family the money which the man has earned; she must not give her husband any cause for thinking that she wastes his means. Never imagine that you can help the home best by going out to work to earn money. You can save a great deal more at home, than you can earn by going out to work. I heard of a woman who went out to work, and who reckoned that she paid more to get someone to do her washing and her sewing and take care of her children, than she could earn by her work. Yet she preferred going out, because she thought it so dull at home. It is a sad thing when a wife and mother feels dull at home, for her truest happiness is to be found in caring for her husband and children.

Again, though Christianity has taught us that women are not made to be the slaves of men's passions, yet there are many men who treat them as if they were, or as if they were merely their playthings. Sometimes women themselves encourage them in this view. How many young girls try to attract the notice of men by their silly laughing, their rough jokes, their giddy ways in the street, appealing thus to the worst side of men. Women should be their companions, not their playthings; and if men treat them as playthings, or worse, it is often largely their own fault. If women respect themselves and behave as they should, they will generally receive proper treatment from men. You may learn a lesson from the birds. It is not the female who seeks to attract the male, but the male with brilliant plumage and beautiful song, who courts the sober plumaged and songless female.

Women should be like the birds, and wait to be courted. Is it not a sad thing to see young girls trying to attract the attention of men? How proud a silly girl is in any class of society of having many men after her. Ought it to be a subject of boast with any woman that she has played with the feelings of any man? Ought not a true woman to feel ashamed if she has led many men to care for her in vain? It is by foolish and silly ways that girls get men to follow after them—just those ways which will not attract the best kind of man. I have heard the story of a young girl's courtship, and I will tell it you in her own words, and you will see how a sensible girl behaved. She says:—"I was walking with my friend Louisa, and up came three young men in Volunteer uniform, and Louisa says, 'Halloa! how are you?' It turns out one of them was her cousin, and the other was a man where he worked. Then we walked with them. I did not care about talking to anyone I did not know anything about. If he was her cousin, what was that to me? So I kept close to Louisa, and did not talk, except when they spoke to me. Well, it seems as if one of them took notice of me keeping so quiet, and when we said good-bye he asked me where I lived, and said might he come on Sunday afternoon to see my mother. Well, I had been taking notice of him, though I did not talk much. I thought it was nice wanting to see mother, and all that, so I said I was quite agreeable. Next Sunday he came, and told mother where he worked and what his parents were; and ever since that we have been keeping company. He always comes for me and takes me home. Mother thinks that is as it should be."

I think so, too; don't you? I am sure the mothers who are here to-night will agree with me that they would like young men to take the trouble to come to see them,

before asking their daughters to walk with them, and to tell them where they work, so that they may find out whether they are respectable and trustworthy. A girl should never be ashamed of her young man, or afraid to take him to see her mother. If a young girl is ashamed of her young man, she had better have nothing to do with him. She should be proud of him, and glad that everyone should see him. If he is not a man she can trust, she had better have nothing to do with him. Sometimes a young man is not over steady, and he will say to a young girl whom he fancies, "If you will only keep company with me and help me, I will keep steady to please you." Do not trust him; tell him that you cannot go with him till he has the strength to keep himself steady. I knew a girl who would not marry a man for years, though she loved him, because he would not give up gambling. She was right. A man will promise anything in order to get his own way, but you must wait to see if he keeps his promise. And it is not only in drink and gambling you must test him. You must see whether he treats other girls with respect, and if he does not, have nothing to say to him, even though he behaves well to you. The man whom you choose as a companion for life should be one whom you can respect, and who will respect you. Remember, if you are a carefully-behaved girl, you will help your friends to keep steady.

In these days we see a great deal of girls trying to be like men in various ways—some bad, some good, some which do not matter much. If girls like to wear shirts and ties, I suppose it does nobody any harm, but when you see girls trying to be like men in their vices, it is quite a different thing. Some years ago it would have been quite a disgrace for a girl to have gone into a public-house, but now, in any town, you may see young girls going in with their young men, just as if it was the right place for them. Girls have no business in a public-house; it is the last place they should go to. They should help to keep the young men out, not follow them in. Again, girls imitate men in gambling and betting. I do not know what excuse we can make for them; I cannot see any. How can a woman given to betting and gambling be a fit manager of a home? How could she be expected to spend money wisely and well? These vices come in both men and women from a foolish and dangerous love of excitement, which is the cause of much misery. Help, by your example and conduct, to keep others from giving way to them.

Then, alas! girls imitate men in their swearing. I do not know how it is in your factories; but if you hear any young girls falling into this evil habit, set your face against it. Set a good example in your places of business, and a good example to your children at home. These bad habits are so easily picked up, but are so hard to cure. I have often been told, though I hope it is not the case with you, that girls are taking to smoking. We cannot call smoking a vice. We know many good men who smoke, and it seems to comfort and soothe them; but we women have got on very well without it up to now, and I think we had better go on without it. There is an old gentleman I know, who, when he is worried, knits a stocking, and says it is as good as a pipe to sooth him; and women, when they are over-worried, had better quiet themselves by sewing or knitting.

I have said we must not imitate men in their vices, but let us imitate them in their virtues. On the whole, men do try to go on improving themselves more than women do. Might not women imitate them in this? There are plenty of opportunities of self-improvement open to all now—lectures to hear, books to read, classes to attend. If you want rest and refreshment, believe me it is not to be found in doing nothing, but in having new interests, a change of occupation, in hearing or learning something which will make life more interesting to you. Then when you go out with some young man, or with your brother or father, you will have something interesting to talk about. I am speaking of women's duties to their companion, and I wish to impress upon you the idea that true companions must help one another on, by making one another better, and wiser, and growing together. If there is a great deal of sin and vice among men, believe me that women have to answer for much of it. Do not think you can ever be happy with a husband if you have led him into sin. Remember there can be true happiness in married life only when husband and wife respect one another, and the young husband and the young wife will not respect one another, unless they respected one another during the days of courtship.

There must be many here who have chosen their companions for life long ago. How are you getting on with them? Perhaps you did not make a very wise choice, but the choice has been made for eternity. If it was not a very good one at the beginning, try to make it a good one now. It is the greatest misfortune of a woman's life to have a bad husband. But what is she to do? She cannot get rid of him. She ought not

to wish to get rid of him. Remember the holiness of marriage. Remember that our dear Lord likened it to the union between Himself and His Church, a union which nobody can destroy. The husband and wife are bound together. They must be companions, and it rests with each to make that companionship as good and faithful as it can be. But if you have got a bad husband, what can you do? First of all, do not give up loving him. Perhaps he just wants someone to show that she will stick by him and help him. You will never make a man good by lecturing him. Never go on scolding or nagging at him. A man does not like being lectured; he won't stand it. He will go out, and won't listen to it. Make a man gradually better by love and care of him, doing all you can to make him happy, not giving way to his follies, never that; but show that you love him, and desire to help him. If you nag at him, he will go to the public-house. Most wives try sometimes to improve their husbands, but they generally make the mistake of lecturing them. Those who have tried that plan will agree that it was a mistake, and that they had much better have left it alone.

A word to those who have got good husbands, or, perhaps, middling husbands. What have you done to keep your love alive through the years you have spent together? Just look back to the days of courtship, and then compare the days of your later life. Is it not a pity that amidst the cares and worries of life, wives often forget to have a loving look for their husband when he comes home from his work—a cheery smile. I do not see why middle-aged wives and husbands should not give each other a kiss when they meet in the evening. I do not know whether all husbands like kisses, but you ought to teach them. Of course, if they dislike it very much, you should not do it to tease them; but, all the same, give them a smile and a loving word when they come in. Remember, all these little things help to make life brighter, for the power of little things to smooth over the troubles of life is very great. Husband and wife should go on through life as true companions, growing in love and holiness, and I should like to leave with you as a last thought, the picture of married life drawn by Robert Burns, when he makes the old wife say to her husband:—

"John Anderson, my jo, John,
When we were first acquent,
Your locks were like the raven,
Your bonnie brow was brent:
But now your brow is beld, John,
Your locks are like the snaw;
But blessing on your frosty pow,
John Anderson, my jo.

John Anderson, my jo, John,
We clamb the hill thegither;
And mony a canty day, John,
We've had wi' ane anither.
Now we maun totter down, John,
But hand in hand we'll go,
And sleep thegither at the foot,
John Anderson, my jo."

Mrs. Sheepshanks.

My friends, do not let the words which have been addressed to us pass from your minds. Let duty to God and duty to man be the mainspring of our lives. If we do our duty to God, and give Him the first place in our lives, having Him in our hearts, and enshrined in our thoughts, we shall be enabled to carry out the second part of our duty towards our neighbour, and by the discharge of our duty towards our neighbour is fulfilled all those manifold duties of children to their parents, parents to their children, husbands to their wives, wives to their husbands, employers to their employed, and employed to their employers. Let us try, dear friends, in our several positions, to do our duty day by day to God and man, and then we shall be truly happy, whatever may be our outward circumstances.

AGRICULTURAL HALL.

FRIDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 11TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

DEVOTIONAL MEETING.

THE SECOND PERSONAL COMING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

(1) ITS PLACE IN HOLY SCRIPTURE;

(2) ITS BEARING UPON

THE MISSION WORK OF THE CHURCH;

THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE OF THE BELIEVER.

PAPERS.

The Ven. THOS. T. PEROWNE, Archdeacon of Norwich.

AN eloquent writer has compared the Scriptures of the Old Testament to some vast forest, "their own Lebanon or Carmel," which is haunted throughout by the Spirit of the future. Everywhere, as we traverse its open glades, or penetrate its dark recesses, a spell is upon us to urge us forward; a shadowy form flits constantly across our path to lure us onward. Revealing much, it promises yet more. Every gift it bestows is the pledge and foretaste of a better gift in store. "All that we see is divine, but all that we see not diviner far."

Now this characteristic of the Scriptures of the Old Testament is shared in common with them by the Scriptures of the New Testament. They, too, are haunted by the Spirit of the future. They, too, urge us forward and lure us onward, promising far more than they reveal, and having far richer gifts in reserve than they bestow. The promise of the Old Testament has indeed become, in large measure, the possession of the New. The gift in store then is the gift in hand now. "Blessed are our eyes, for they see, and our ears, for they hear." But there is no finality, no rest, no satisfaction yet: the goal, the crown, the home, are beyond us still.

In another respect also, the two divisions of Holy Scripture are, as we should anticipate, in complete accord. Not only does the Spirit of the future pervade them both, but it is subject in both to the same conditions. In both it assumes a personal shape. In both it clothes itself in flesh, and becomes, if I may so say, incarnate. In both it is a partaker of our nature, and assumes a form which, though divine, is also human. *The advent of a Person*, of a Son of Man, is the hope of the Bible. The Bible tells us of a "world to come," and of "good things to come"; but it is in "the Coming One" that it bids us look for them:

> "Yet a very little while
> He that cometh shall come, and shall not tarry,"

is the message of both Testaments alike. "The testimony of Jesus is

the spirit of prophecy." His doubly is the first note of the long-drawn prophetic strain. He, its Author, as the prophet of His Church, proclaims Himself, "the seed of the woman," the Virgin-born, as her Deliverer. His doubly, His own prediction of His own return, its last note also, "He that testifieth these things saith, Behold, I come quickly." The limits of the present dispensation are clearly defined in the creed of Christendom by two personal events: "He ascended into heaven;" "from thence He shall come again." The heaven that closed upon the pomp of His departure shall open again for the transcendent pomp of His return. "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into Heaven." To that coming all avenues of Christian promise and prophecy conduct. On it all lines of Christian thought and hope, of Christian work and effort, converge.

It is on this truth, in its broad outlines, that I am invited to dwell this morning. Some special aspects and applications of it will be dealt with by those who follow me. I am to show, as I may be able, that the place assigned in Holy Scripture to the Second Personal Coming of our Lord is such as I have described it to be.

(1) There is no nearer concern to every man, no subject of more anxious thought or more supreme endeavour, than his own complete emancipation from sin and its consequences. It was the promise of the first Advent: "He shall save His people from their sins;" and the first Advent has done much to accomplish it. From those who rightly receive its benefits it has taken quite away that awful consequence of sin which we call its guilt. It lifts them into the sphere of favour, of acceptance, of peace with God. They are sinless in the Sinless One. For that other consequence of sin—cause and consequence alike—the depravation of the character, the disruption of its unity, the sullying of its purity, the paralysis of its power, the "heavenly virtues" attendant upon that first Advent have, indeed, provided an effectual remedy. But the remedy is slow, as men count slowness, to take effect. What soldier of the Cross but echoes sometimes anxiously, wearily, impatiently, despondingly it may be, the cry, "Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?" "Unto his life's end" was the condition on which he accepted service: unto his life's end must he be content manfully to fight under the banner of his Lord. And when that end comes, the noblest part of his complex being will, indeed, be set free for ever. His spirit will live with Almighty God, and will be numbered among "the spirits of just men made perfect." But his body, fearfully and wonderfully made, redeemed by the Precious Blood, the temple of the Holy Ghost will, to the eye of sense, be abandoned to the enemy. "The body is dead because of sin." Is that then, indeed, the end? Is that the issue of so protracted a campaign, by so vast an army, under so great a General, which leaves so costly a part of the spoils beneath the heel of the insulting foe? We know that it is not. But till He comes it will seem to be so. "Perfect consummation" both in body and soul is the guerdon He bestows on His faithful soldiers. But it is in Person, and at His Second Coming that He bestows it. "We know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him;" and He is "the Holy One of God."

(2) And this body, given back to us without sin, is to be without

suffering also. It is true that even now we have come in the Church of God

> "to know
> The gain of grief, the blessedness of woe."

Unlike sin—which must ever remain our deadliest foe—sorrow, the child of sin, has become for us the enemy of sin, and our own most faithful friend. The Man of sorrows is therefore the Lord of sorrows. They are His, and ours in Him. It is true also that death, the supreme sorrow and agony of our mortal nature, puts an end for ever for the child of God to sorrow and suffering, as it does to sin. "The souls of the righteous, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity." No anguish of heart, no writhing of pain, no burden of infirmity, no well-spring of tears, finds place in that blessed Paradise of God. "They rest from their labours." "To depart and be with Christ is very far better." And yet their anodyne has cost them dear. From sorrow, as from sin, the release of the whole man is not perfected there. What that release shall be, a body that cannot suffer and that cannot sin, we must have that we may comprehend. But the Archetype has been seen on earth. Human eyes looked upon it, human hands handled it, human ears drank in the melody of its accents, human hearts rejoiced in the sunshine of its love. And He showed it to us then in token that He would give it us at His return. "From whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, Who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be made like unto the sinless, painless body of His glory."

Nor to the Church collective is any other or earlier consummation proposed than to her individual members.

(3) *Her purity:* when shall it be perfected? When shall there no longer place be found in her either for error in doctrine or for viciousness in life? When shall she no longer need to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, or to mourn over and rebuke the faults of her children? We strive for purity, and, believe me, we never strive in vain. No true effort after it, but is a true advance towards it. "Thou didst well that it was in thine heart," is the Master's comforting word to every true lover of purity. But "wait for it while you love it," is His warning word also. "Let both grow together till the harvest. . . . And the harvest in the end of the world." Then, when the great harvest Lord returns, shall He gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them that work iniquity. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." When the Bridegroom comes He will present unto Himself His Bride, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing. The fair flower of purity will never expand in all its heavenly beauty till the Sun of Righteousness be risen upon it.

(4) And *the unity* of the Church, when shall that be complete? When shall her spotless robe of purity be seen to be her seamless robe of unity also? Why, we ask ourselves, should it not be even now? There stands amongst us, with outstretched arms, the winning form of unity, inviting us to yield ourselves with one accord to be folded in her embrace. But there comes between another form, of no less radiant beauty, if of aspect more severe, she too with arms outstretched, the

form of truth, and bids us commit ourselves first to her, that she, who alone can do so, may conduct us to unity. But truth, alas! is for us manifold. She herself has lost for us her unity, and so for the unity which should be her gift, we have discord and division.

In our best moments, when from the holy book, the holy day, the holy house, the holy table, the spirit of unity is breathed into our souls by the Lord of unity, "the Author of peace, and Lover of concord," our very being utters forth the prayer, "Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." But though in that prayer, waxing louder and more intense, we hail an omen that the night of discord is far spent, and the day of unity is at hand, yet not till that day, "the day of the Lord," dawns, shall His prayer and ours. "that they all may be one," be manifestly and completely answered. Not till then shall we "all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man."

(5) And as in the individual, and in the Church, so also in *the world*, the conflict with evil must continue till the Second Personal Coming of our Lord.

We have need, I think, to remind ourselves of this. A hope unwarranted is a hope that maketh ashamed. To misunderstand our mission may be to tamper with our message. We are to win the world, and therefore we will win it at any cost—if not on our Master's terms, yet at least upon its own. Impatient for the end, we will render to man the things that are man's, even though it be by withholding from God the things that are God's. To win the world for Christ is not ours, nor is it yet. To work for it, to hope for it, to pray for it, to help it forward, yea, to hasten it, that is ours. To achieve it, that is His Like the loyal captain of the host of Israel of old, the Church, when she has done her utmost against the stronghold of the enemy, must summon her King to come and take the city, lest the fame of its capture should be hers, and her name should be called upon it.

"Repent, and be converted," is to be our cry to the world, "that times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord;" but more than this, "that He may send Jesus Christ, whom the heaven must receive until the time of the restitution of all things." Every conversion, national or individual, to the faith of Christ, accelerates that day; every missionary effort brings it nearer. All Israel shall indeed be saved, and their recovery shall be as life from the dead to the world at large. But that shall be when "the Redeemer shall come to Zion." Till then God is visiting the Gentiles to take out of them a people for His name; till then a remnant only of Israel is gathered in.

(6) Nor must we hide from ourselves, or from others, the dark and awful side of that Second Coming as it is revealed to us in holy Scripture. It is a powerful motive in the heart: "Knowing the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." It is an urgent plea upon the lips: "Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish." The solemn strain, "Behold the Lord cometh to execute judgment," begun by Enoch, the seventh from Adam. waxes louder and more terrible, till it issues in the din of "the battle of that great day of Almighty God," and in the mighty cry of the angel with a strong voice, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen:" "The kingdom of this world is become the kingdom of our God, and of His Christ:" "Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

The mystery of lawlessness will work till the barriers that restrain it are taken away; and then it shall culminate in "the man of sin," "the lawless one," "whom the Lord shall consume with the breath of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His coming."

(7) But the promised victory over evil is wider and more far-reaching still. It is co-extensive, as indeed we feel it ought to be, with its tyranny and its curse. If the ruin of man involved the ruin of his kingdom, is it not reasonable to expect that the recovery of man should involve the recovery of his kingdom also? And so indeed it will do.

> "The groans of nature in this nether world,
> Which Heaven has heard for ages, have an end,
> Foretold by prophets, and by poets sung,
> Whose fire was kindled at the prophet's lamp."

And not by prophets and by poets only, but in the sober prose and praccal exhortations of our Lord and His Apostles. "We, according to His promise, look for . . . a new earth." The earth, once purged by water, shall be purged a second time by fire, and shall emerge from that fiery baptism in more than its pristine comeliness. The travail pangs of nature are to issue in a glorious birth. The earnest expectation of creation (*ἀποκαραδόκια*) is to be satisfied by its deliverance from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. "To every creature," "to the whole creation," is the scope of the Gospel message. Even now, when man accepts it, nature, animate and inanimate, is a partaker with him in its blessings. The wilderness and the solitary place are glad, and the desert rejoices and blossoms as the rose. The valleys laugh and sing; all sheep and oxen, the beasts of the earth, and the fowls of the air rest from cruelty, and are glad. And the fulness of the Gospel for man will be its fulness for creation also. The beauty and the grandeur of nature are prophetic within us even now. Sin and Satan have not wrested this fair globe of ours from its Maker and its King. Even now He has not left us without witness that it is His. One day He will vindicate it openly for His own. "Scenes surpassing fable" shall then be true.

> "Come, then, and added to Thy many crowns,
> Receive yet one, the crown of all the earth,
> Thou, Who alone art worthy."

This, then, is the glorious *ἀνακεφαλαιώσις*, or gathering together of all things in one in Christ, and in His Second Personal Coming, to which all things tend. For the Church and for the world; for the individual and for the race; for body and for soul; for man and for his kingdom, this is the object of expectation, the goal of patience and prayer and effort, which Holy Scripture proposes. Thus does every heaven-born ray that cheers and guides us on our road, lead up to, and blend into the pure, perfect light of His appearing. In that light shall we see light. The mirror shall be laid aside, and the enigma solved. The mystery of God shall be finished. The day shall dawn and the shadows flee away. The lost shall be found again, and the estranged reconciled. The sentence of approval, "Well done, good and faithful servant," and the gracious invitation, "Come, ye blessed of My Father," shall call forth the wondering response, "Why should the King recompense it me with such a reward?" The faithful Pastor shall then find in the flock which he

has painfully tended, his joy and crown of rejoicing. "They that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever." No pain, no sorrow, no want, no loneliness, no death, no strife, no discord, no disappointment, no coldness, no envy, no lust, no conflict, no temptation, no anger, no remorse. These and far more than these, far more than tongue can tell or heart conceive, are the things that are to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ. Time was when this "blessed hope" filled the whole horizon of the Church. Time was when "to wait for His Son from heaven" was half the occupation of a Christian, and to "love His appearing," his happy designation. Time was when the tears of the mourner were dried by the assurance, "Them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him," and the aspirations of the saint dared to picture for himself an escape from the painful unclothing of death, and the joyful clothing upon in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, of the living at His coming again. Time was when the Bride, in the kindness of her youth, and the love of her espousals, yearned all too impatiently for the Bridegroom's return. But the Bridegroom has tarried long, and faith and hope and love have grown cold. Yet even now, above the loud, stunning tide of human care and crime, above the clamour of controversy, and the strife of tongues, there falls upon the purged ear the long expected cry, "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh." And even now the Church prepares her welcome. "He that testifieth these things saith, Behold, I come quickly. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

(2) Its bearing upon the Mission Work of the Church.

The Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

From some sides my theme is almost as difficult as it is sacred. It is no easy theme to one who has to own that around the details, even the greater details, of "that blessed hope, the appearing of His glory," he finds many an unsolved mystery. Not perfectly am I assured of the voice of the Word of God on more than one great question of the kind; above all, on the time-relation between the Return of our exalted Lord from heaven and the inauguration on earth of a period of world-wide spiritual blessing. In other words, after not a little inquiry and reflection (I trust as before God), I still know not which of two main views of the Christian's hope best responds to the prophecies—the pre-millennial or the post-millennial. And many a problem of the mysterious thousand-years itself remains for me insoluble.

It is a reluctant avowal; but in one respect it may be even helpful to make it. For it may be positively useful to remember that the sacred questions of the prophetic future, as soon as they pass at all into detail, do not touch articles of faith in the same sense as questions, for example, about justification and holiness do. They lie partly on the field of eternal principle, but not wholly; they lie partly also on the field of historical inquiry. In no part of sacred study therefore should we be more cautious of premature assertion, and more watchful, in face of differences, of the bond of peace.

Meantime, this paper, so I would humbly hope, will not be a mere avowal of uncertainties. Be the unsolved points what they may be, there are, assuredly, great landmarks of certainty in the future, quite enough for our purpose to-day; quite enough to quicken faith, to brighten hope, and at the same moment to chasten and animate the Christian in every thought and effort in missionary work.

(1) First of such landmarks is the revealed certainty of the infinitely mysterious, but veritable, unfigurative, Return of our King and Saviour. "This same Jesus . . . shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." From the first days that oracle has been to the people of God an anchor of thought and hope. It cannot be evacuated of its glorious literality without altering it into something altogether different from its verbal contents. Whatever the preludes to that Coming Again, it will veritably take place. Whatever the surroundings of it, and the sequels, it will veritably take place. In the future, somewhere, lies—what certainly the past has not seen—that Coming: "this same Jesus," so, "in like manner."

(2) Again, there lies assuredly in the future, foretold in the Word, asked for with the asking of an infinite need by the world, the landmark of a grand development of the power of the Holy Ghost in the Church and for the world. "I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh." That word was indeed a prediction of Pentecost. But it connects itself naturally with other predictions which portend a practical universality of spiritual power and bliss. Such promises certainly have yet to be fulfilled; and the normal course of things in Christendom shows no very clear tendency, of its own motion, towards the fulfilment. Notably, that prospect connects itself with the promise of a return of blessing to the scattered Hebrew race. It is written, "All Israel shall be saved;" and that in a context which reasonably assures us that the reference is national. And this again is linked with a prospect of altogether abnormal blessing for the world; for, "What shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" To that future few would say that the normal course of things in either Israel or Christendom is tending. The promise waits rather a fiat and a touch from heaven; it points to a coming epoch of the work of the Spirit. That epoch will assuredly have relation to developments of human history, but it will not be merely their product. It will come from above to meet them.

(3) And all this is to bear relation to the Return of our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven; His return to be the Judge indeed, but not the Judge alone—for while prophecy does indeed predict a tribunal, white and awful, fully as much it predicts a jubilant welcome, a marriage supper, an infinitely benignant empire. Whether the epoch of the Spirit shall prelude, accompany, or follow the Return, it is profoundly connected with it and related to it. It has everything to do with the glorification of Jesus. In it, HE will come, with that spiritual Advent without which the Advent in the letter would be nothing but our terror and despair, instead of being, as it is, "that blessed hope."

These great elements of holy expectation I mention thus, because I believe that Christians who differ widely on parts of the great subject would meet on them. The personal, veritable, Return of our beloved Lord, that Return to which, at every Communion feast, the Apostle bids us look forward; we meet on this. The hope of days of heaven

upon the earth in a mightier manifestation yet of the Spirit's power; we meet on this. Some of us have seen in our lifetime days which have looked like the first showers of the great rain. Who that witnessed the solemn scenes of the religious revival of thirty-five years ago can ever forget them? It was a time different from any that I remember since in respect of its entire independence of any elaborated preparation, or organized action, or central and commanding name. From district to district, from town to town, in city and in village, in England, in Ireland, in America, men far and wide were stirred with a consciousness of eternity, an awe of God, an asking for Christ, a cry for the Gospel. There were drawbacks, there were disappointments, there was decline. But I dare affirm that those years were years of great harvests for the Lord, harvests of sound wheat; and the sheaves would have been heavier had the Church of Christ known better how to recognize and to serve the opportunity.

Since then there have been many times of extended and memorable spiritual action, recalling that great period. But there has been less spontaneousness in the phenomena as to their rise, and, so far, less of the manifestly Divine. But we look for great things of the Divine order in the future, in view of the word of promise, and of these preludes of fulfilment. The coming Saviour, and *as* the coming Saviour, has still the mighty "residue of the Spirit." In relation to His own glorious Return, He will "revive His work in the midst of the years," and there shall be "life from the dead."

What now is the relation of this hope to the missionary work of the Church?

Broadly speaking, the doctrine of the glorious Return reminds us that one great part of the missionary purpose must be to *prepare the way of the Lord, to make His paths straight.* To adopt the most modern of metaphors, it must be to lay the wires everywhere, ready for the fire and power of the exalted and returning Master.

I say this must be one great part of the missionary purpose. It would be a dangerous mistake to speak as if it were all. I deplore it when I see, as I sometimes do, the missionary enterprise treated as if it were only, or almost only, a work of preparatory "witness." Such a view forgets some of our Lord's own plainest words; above all His *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, "Turn all the nations into disciples;" words which cannot be reconciled with the idea of only an elementary evangelization, only an itinerant witness, only as it were a mechanical hastening of the Return. Those words of the great Commission bid the missionary, the Churches, the Church, labour—whatever *else* be their purpose—with a full purpose, in the grace of God, to achieve an actual and developed result among the nations; not to evangelize only, but to "make disciples" far and wide—disciples in the full sense of the word, a sense all too little exemplified as yet, on any great scale, since the first age. The missionary is to attempt such "discipling" as earnestly as if he had no merely preparatory and line-laying work to do, but were himself the ultimate avenue of the fulfilment of the promises. He is to be patient and thorough in development, as well as energetic in inception. He is to aim at spiritual education, and not only at spiritual births; still less only at a brief passing "witness" which he almost assumes is to

leave the mass of hearers where they were, "till the Lord come." With this motto in mind, "Turn all the nations into disciples," the missionary enterprise must always find room for comprehensive and prospective plans and methods; for the Christian school, for the Christian application of general education, for the patient training and development of the life and strength of native Churches, for pastoral care as well as evangelistic aggression. True, every native Church should be led to become itself an active centre of evangelization. But then it must be *led* in that direction. And this must always involve, under God, the diligent pastoral attention of the missionary to his converts; his instruction, his example, his loving leadership and fellowship with them, till they by the grace of God catch the holy fire and realize that the Christian Church exists to shine, is saved to serve, is brought into the love of God in Christ that it may witness of Him to the world. Such a work has been done, and with most cheering success, by a dear friend of my own in Africa. His earlier longings for more missionaries from England have lately much given way to longings for more missionaries from Africa for Africa. With loving persistency he has aimed to raise up true evangelists among his own young native men. The results have been full of encouragement. But they have demanded a kind of work on the missionary's part quite different from that of the passing "witness," who only as it were stays to say that the King is coming.

But then, it is true all the time that the missionary's own soul must be always true to the fact that the King *is* coming, and that he *is* to prepare His way. Whilst doing his own utmost, in the Lord, to "turn the nations into disciples," he will remember always that the prospect of a *full* achievement is linked indissolubly to the blessed hope and its attendant promises. After all, the one part of his work in which, humanly and reverently speaking, he can command results is the laying of the line ready for the force from heaven. Every present conversion is indeed (as he well knows) an instance of that force; for it is "the free Spirit" who alone, always, everywhere, brings man to the feet of Christ; yes, though a Paul plants and an Apollos waters. But then the promises lead him to look, in the unfolding of God's plan, as the longed-for coming of the Lord draws on, for a vast and decisive *enlargement* in the Master's use of the servant's labour. So he works with unquenchable hope for that future, τῷ τέλει πίστιν φέρων, "giving his reliance to the end."

Thus it is his ceaseless business, his never-disappointing enterprise, to prepare for the final epoch of the Spirit, in the light of the blessed Hope. He diffuses to the utmost the knowledge of the saving facts, in order that, so far, the line may be laid for the great Advent of the saving power.

From this point I regard with the deepest interest the missionary idea which within the last few years has possessed the hearts of multitudes of Christians both in America and here. Briefly stated, it is the idea that the Church of Christ is now called to attempt to evangelize the world within the limits of a human generation. The thought is, distinctively, of a primary evangelization. The aim is, that competent messengers of the name of Christ, true to their Lord, should be sent into the non-Christian world in such numbers, and so distributed, that the sound of the saving Name should within no long period be

known practically everywhere. In such a programme much will instantly occur to the thoughtful Christian for correction or for caution in the proposed or possible details. But I cannot but own that the idea seems to me nobly true and reasonable. And the extraordinary development, within just this decade, of the missionary consciousness, so to speak, in the student-world of both America and Great Britain, suggests the hope that within another decade we may see such numbers of well-equipped messengers in the vast foreign field as to make the proposed distribution seem no visionary prospect.

If the thoughts here indicated are at all true to the main facts, we have in them at once a caution and a profound encouragement. They say on the one hand, Work on, as if all the future depended on the present phase of labour; for it is the Lord's command. They say on the other, Remember that the Church is a Church waiting as well as militant, waiting for the mighty future, waiting for the forthcoming of the Spirit and for the Return of the Son; hoping for that which we see not yet, but which will come, and meet the work, and transfigure it, and crown it with a triumph which shall be openly supernatural. And here lies the encouragement. It is the argument of the close of 1 Cor. xv., "Be unmovable in the work of the Lord; for it is not in vain in the Lord." The triumphant future is not in your hands but in the Lord's, who is coming again, to meet and bless you in your work for His Name.

So "that blessed hope" shines in upon the missionary enterprise in all its parts. It shines upon the home-work for it; on the humblest gift of love, on the largest work of administration, on the manifold methods of information and appeal, on the altars of sacrifice where parents yield up their best-beloved to remotest exile for the Lord. It shines upon the vast field itself; on the missionaries, men and women, and on the new-born native Churches and their ministry. And it shines upon hundreds of holy graves, where the pilgrims of the Lord have been laid to rest in Him, some worn out by the long but beloved labour, some slain by the poison of the air, some by the axe of the cannibal islander, some—so lately—martyrs whom some of us have counted among our familiar friends, by the sword and fire of the fanatic murderer in China.

Missionary life and death—it all lies in the light of "that blessed hope," which is not only its solace but its issue and its goal.

---

(2) Its Bearing upon the Individual Life of the Believer.

The Rev. J. H. Lester, Rector of Lexden; and Prebendary of Lichfield.

The Christian Creed in reference to our Lord is based upon a series of facts. Each fact introduces a new relationship between man and God; and constitutes a further step in the accomplishment of His eternal purpose.

In the fulness of time the Incarnation took place; then the Passion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension. This first coming has been called the central fact of the world's history, for it was the beginning of a re-creation of humanity. But its effect is beneath the surface of life. "It

doth not yet appear." So in silence Christ came. The glory was veiled, and the world went on its way.

One last event is still to come. In the fulness of time Christ will appear again. The glory will be unveiled. The effect will transcend all that has gone before, for then will "appear" that for which the Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, have been the preparation—the Manifestation of the sons of God.

But the recitation of these sentences of the Creed is more than a statement of fact. The "I believe" interprets their significance to the soul. They fix its spiritual altitude, they regulate the formation of its character. We know what it is to contemplate the mystery of Bethlehem, it is the revelation of the way to the Father. We know what it is to kneel before the mystery of Calvary, for there we read in letters of blood the Covenant of Reconciliation. We know what it is to look by faith within the Veil and see the High Priest at His Altar-Throne in prevailing Intercession. Do we equally know the power of the Second Advent, when faith lays hold of the substance of things hoped for?—"I believe that He will come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead."

The influence of the coming of our Lord is derived partly from the circumstances of preparation, and partly from the event itself.

I.—It is a matter of regret that rash interpretations of prophecy, and their consequent failure, have unduly discredited the consideration of the subject.

First, as regards the time of His appearing. Alas! when men map out the ground where angels may not tread! It is a part of the highest human knowledge to know what not to know.

But we turn to the New Testament. How engrossing was the expectation of His coming those brief twenty years after the Ascension! How the Apostle returns to it again and again, in each chapter of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians! It was his foremost thought. And how could anything seem more out of place than that Epistle written to us? The change of attitude is not altogether due to the loss of the first love. It has been wrought by the lapse of time. It was just as natural for them to speak of Christ's coming, as it is natural for us to speak of going to Him. They thought of His appearing as the next event before them, and yet all those first believers passed into the Paradise of God. We speak of the "Intermediate State" as the next thing before us, and yet not all who are alive now may be called upon to die. Indeed, if we compare the first of S. Paul's letters with all the rest of his epistles, in the order in which they were written, we can trace the same change of feeling already taking place. We must remember that the facts remain the same, while the change of emphasis is only natural. It is only when presumption re-acts in indifference that we are wrong.

Secondly, as regards identifying the signs of the Second Advent with some crisis in the history of the Church or the world. The signs of preparation have influenced, and do influence, the faith and life of the believer.

Two lines of development are pointed out by S. Paul—

(1) The Mystery of Iniquity, already at work in his time, and working still through the centuries, until finally manifested in the Anomos—the Anti-Christ himself.

(2) A Restraining Power, holding it in check, from age to age, until finally restraint fails, sin triumphs, then is crushed by the sudden unveiling of Christ's Personal presence in glory and power. Now, what is this Mystery of Iniquity?

Surely it is that which becomes the Anomos—infidel, lawless, denying the Incarnation, defiant alike of God and man. Surely it was in that malignant enmity against God, which refused to acknowledge the divine power of Christ, which hated His goodness, and which He declared to be beyond forgiveness. We see it working in antagonism to the Apostles, breaking out in persecution from time to time, and kept in check by the officers of Roman law and order—that Nomos, which S. Paul describes as a "Minister of God for good." We see it in the troubles of the fifth and sixth centuries, and restrained by the imperial rule of Clovis and Charlemagne. We see it in the failure of old restraints at the Reformation, when Luther confessed with tears, before his death, that crime and ungodliness had increased. We see it in the infidel revolt of France a century ago, and then restrained by the restoration of law and order and religious worship under Napoleon I. Can we discern it now, held down by law and order still, but ready to break out again, defiant of God, denying the Incarnation, burning in the evil passions of men? If so, the meaning is plain. It is a call to preparation. It is not less so because the veil is only just lifted in prophecy—the glimpse is practically enough—the final conflict of the Church, and then the glory of the raptured Saints around their Lord. It is not less so because the time is uncertain; for how else could it bring a true test of character?

(1) The first effect of the anticipation of a coming so solemn, so decisive, so uncertain, should be Watchfulness—I had almost said, a sustained thoughtfulness. To use life seriously, as that for which we must give account. To avoid the waste of time and means, and of noble powers of intellect and affection, in worthless and pernicious ways. Half the sins of the world arise from thoughtlessness. A lifetime may be lost for eternity, because each little period slips so easily away. We need always to remember that the Master may be at the door.

Watchfulness is also to be awake, like soldiers at their post, observant of what is going on. It notes the filling in of the last blank spaces of the map of the world, and missions treading on the heels of exploration. Is this the completion of the witness to all nations? It hears of the re-peopling of Palestine. Is this the restoration of Israel? It marks the decline of old-fashioned piety, the substitution of a vague Deism for the faith once delivered to the saints. The avowal of an agnosticism which escapes the toil of thought, and shelves the claims of religious responsibility. Is this the coming apostacy? It hears of crime dogging the steps of secular education, of an increase of suicide, of a reckless destruction of human life in desperate war on the restraints of law and order, as if human life had no future, and God had no purpose in the destiny of mankind. Is this the Mystery of Iniquity at work? Is this the sound of the approaching footsteps of the Lawless One? Who can tell? One thing is certain; the fires are smouldering beneath the surface, and the time draws on. The ingredients are all in the cup; it only needs the addition of some drop to resolve and precipitate them.

(2) Another characteristic should be Calmness. Calm in awaiting the last severe discipline of fellowship in the sufferings of our Lord.

Calm in holding fast the faith of the Catholic Church in the midst of excited speculation and deceptive prophecy. Calm in the discharge of duty, though signs appear in heaven and earth. There was sound sense in the good old Puritan, who, when sudden darkness came on during a meeting, and one suggested that it should be given up because the Lord might be at hand, remarked, "Then bring in candles, for we had better be found doing our business."

(3) And if the final struggle between the Church and the world may be at hand, surely another characteristic of the faithful soul will be to keep in the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ; to enter the last battle-field with ranks closed for mutual support, for combined strength, for unanimous witness on the side of God. "That they may be one, as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee, that they may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me," was the last wish of our Lord—and the converse is true. How often, at a crisis in the Church's history, has a revival of intense expectation resulted in an impatient restlessness, which would not wait in the Church? In the earliest days the revolt was individual—"a brother walking disorderly." In the extended life of the Church it becomes sectional—an excited *coterie*, losing the balance of proportion, and going off in pursuit of an ideal, destined either to burn out and pass away, or to linger on in narrow exclusiveness. Where the restraints of the Kingdom of God are broken through, the very hope of Millennium prepares the way of the Mystery of Iniquity.

In a word, the anticipation of Christ's coming lays on the believer three lines of duty:—

(1) Watchfulness in a life of thoughtful recollectedness.
(2) Calmness in face of the Church's coming conflict.
(3) Patience under the restraints of order in the Spiritual Kingdom.

II.—Next, the Advent itself. The thunder of the Archangel over a shuddering world; the unfolding vision of the heavenly hosts; the resurrection of the blessed dead, in their human bodies glorified; the living caught up from the earth and changed as in a moment; the unveiling of the presence of the Lord in the glory of His Perfected Humanity, in the splendour of the Divine Majesty; the manifestation of the sons of God!

Can faith at all realize this final consummation? If so, then the beautiful dawn of Christian hope brightens over the clouds of human pain and sorrow. The time may be short, and the reflection of Christian hope is spiritual joy. We are sustained by the joy that is set before us.

But that final scene is inexpressibly solemn. Being what we are, can we hope to stand in the pure whiteness of that sinless Presence? Surely that depends on living consciously, like Israel of old, under the shelter of the Precious Blood. Can we bear the unveiled brightness of His coming—the manifestation of spiritual glory, so strange and beautiful, as the Apostles saw it on the Holy Mount, so strange and terrible as Saul felt it to be outside Damascus. Do we cherish the habit of Communion with God under present conditions? If so, surely this is preparation for fuller Communion under altered conditions.

And then the *reality* of it all. The saints rise again with their bodies. The sanctification of the body in view of the future life rests on our

faith in the reality of the Resurrection at His coming. "When He shall appear we shall be like Him." There is need to distinguish between revelation and sentiment. There is need to remember that the body is not precisely the same thing as the material out of which it is constructed. During this life the material changes: the body is continuous. What is that mysterious power in us which assimilates material, and in building up the body preserves its individuality, its distinctive likeness and character, so that it is not merely tenanted by the soul, but is rather the organ through which the soul expresses itself? What enables a plant to take up a little dust and water, and transform this material into the delicate texture and colouring of its bloom? The Autumn leaves, sere, and soiled, and storm-torn, fall to decay on the ground. The winter branches will be bare. But when the fulness of time comes, each tree will clothe itself with its own foliage fresh and perfect. What is the secret? It is life—life that has at once continuity and individuality. The living beech does not recover the foliage of the oak. Each gets back its own. It is not then a strange thing that *my* body shall rise again. As through life the living soul acts upon the body, and in goodness or evil shapes its own; so then the living soul gets back its own.

And when to this natural order we add the consideration that it is God Incarnate Who says, "I am the Resurrection and the Life," what distances of possible advancement for soul and body are opened up! What encouragement is added to warning to keep the body in temperance, soberness, and chastity!

Once again, the resurrection of the body is so real because bound up with the re-appearing of the Incarnate Lord. It is just this which marks the relationship of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ with the resurrection of the body at His coming. When Christ comes again, it will not be a return to the lower conditions under which we live, and He, too, lived before His passion, but we shall be taken up into the higher conditions of His glorified human life. "This same Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven."

In this exaltation the body must participate. We are to meet Him on that higher level of recreated humanity into which He has carried His own Sacred Body through the mysteries of death and resurrection. So in Holy Communion I receive, not merely the sacred pledges of a dying Saviour's love, but from His uplifted and glorified Humanity, the Holy Spirit brings to me that which enters into me, and carries on the re-creation of my humanity, and prepares my body for the change at His coming. So He says, "Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life, and *I will raise him up at the last day.*" Every Christian should be a communicant. This is a truth not enough recognized in schools of subjective religious thought. Why? Because the ministries of the Word and prayer act on thought and feeling, and their effect is in the character, which is on the surface and seen of all. But the Holy Communion affects the nature, and nature is beneath the surface. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." Sacramental grace works beneath the surface now, but when He comes again and we rise to meet Him, lo! on the very countenances of the saints, the family likeness of the children of the heavenly home!

Lastly, the second Advent is the consummation of the Communion of

Saints—the living members of His body. Christ will come again, not alone, but surrounded by all who have lived and died in communion with Him. This, too, affects each individual believer.

There is one fundamental truth which in the light of the second Advent has great significance. The distinctive proposal of Christianity is the formation of an eternal brotherhood and home. Other religious systems have aimed at the exaltation of man; the Gospel of Christ proposes a perfect family in a heavenly Father's home.

It is this which appeals to the deepest and truest instincts of our being. We follow the friends we love to the death-bed, and they pass from us. We stand a few moments beside the open grave, but we must turn away. We revisit the scenes of the past, but the old place is not what it was: those are gone who made it home. Is this the end of all that seemed so full of promise?

Our hearts refuse to believe that bonds of pure affection, binding together husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, should grow year after year in strength and sweetness, and then suddenly be snapped and broken, and perish in the grave, and leave nothing to us but the pale ashes of a hopeless memory. No! Such friendships are for eternity. The Son of God became Incarnate that homes on earth might be gathered into a final home in heaven. And they will be if only their friendships are "in Christ," for those who fall asleep in Him will God bring with Him—at His coming.

"On that happy Easter morning
All their dead the graves restore:
Father, sister, child, and mother, meet once more."

The Rev. H. W. Hitchcock.

[*Read by Archdeacon Emery.*]

I am requested to read a paper on "The Second Coming of our Lord: its bearing on the individual life of the believer," and must ask the indulgence of the Congress, as I was compelled to write, owing to illness, either on board ship or in South Africa, away from all books of reference. Perhaps some of the people I met, and the scenes which I witnessed, have brought to my mind thoughts which would not otherwise have occurred to me. One watches such varied lives, and is brought into such close contact with them on board ship. The politician, the capitalist, the scientific man, the miner, the sailor, the officers, and the crew; the religious and the irreligious; the thoughtful and the careless; the pursuit of money, the desire for gold leading men to fresh fields and distant lands; and then through one's mind ever floating the old Bible words, "They did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed." The world, and the world-satisfied, engrossed in the pursuit of the things temporal, while beneath, like the vast ocean with its resistless currents, move the eternal purposes of God.

Or, again, I stood on the shores of that mighty mysterious continent of Africa, where seem to gather men of every race and clime—English, American, German, French, Portuguese, Dutch, Malay, every nation represented; and from within come the members of the native tribes—

Hottentots, Zulus, Kaffirs, and an innumerable company of mixed descent, all with souls to be saved, all with souls for which the one dear Lord and Master died on Calvary; the Saviour of the white man and the black man, of the slave and of the free. And again the old familiar gospel words run through one's memory day and night, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." What hinders the work, what retards the coming of the kingdom? Shall I say our unfaith, our lack of zeal—what?

Of course I am dealing with that which is familiar to you, but I must refer to the faith of the members of the early Church in the second Advent of their Lord. It was a belief which was a present and a constraining motive with them. It was founded on their Master's own words, "I will come again"; "Watch, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." It was enforced by the angelic revelation after the Ascension, "This same Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." It found utterance in the early sermons of S. Peter, "He shall send Jesus Christ. . . . Whom the heaven must receive until the time of restitution of all things." And you know how prominently this same Apostle S. Peter keeps the thought before those to whom he writes in his Epistles. "Ready to be revealed at the last time"; "at the appearing of Jesus Christ"; "at the revelation of Jesus Christ"; "Him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead"; "when the chief Shepherd shall appear." How full the first Epistle is of this belief! Then take the last chapter of the second Epistle, and you see the current of popular thought already showing itself. "Where is the promise of His coming?" and you hear the words, never old, but ever true, of rebuke and of practical warning, "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some men count slackness; but is long suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish. . . . But the day of the Lord *will* come as a thief in the night. . . . What manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness?" The veil is lifted, and we see the reason of the tarrying, the mercy of our God. Nevertheless, "He that shall come will come"; therefore "be ye ready, for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh."

It would be easy to show from the writings of S. Paul how frequently in his mind and in his teaching was the prospect of the return of Him in Whom he had believed, but I can only touch upon his testimony. "The day of Christ," how he makes the expectation the basis of his exhortation to purity of heart and practical religion. "To meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord": how the words tell of his present hope in sorrow and affliction, of the comfort which he experienced himself and desired to impart to others. "Looking for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ"; "looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." How the words describe his constant spiritual attitude, his hope, his longing and desire. There is, too, the corroborative testimony of S. John; but on that I must touch later. I would like to have endeavoured to trace the belief in the second Advent in the writings of the Fathers of the early Church, but these being far from me I turn to the only other book which is at hand, and which is so familiar

to you all, the Book of Common Prayer, just to point out to you how constant is the Church's expression of faith in her Master's coming, and how strangely it contrasts with our general forgetfulness of that in which we profess to believe.

We use no office of our Church without the recitation of the prayer taught us by Him Whose coming we expect, saying ever "Our Father, . . . Thy kingdom come." We never recite the articles of our faith, either in daily Eucharist or daily Matins and Evensong, without the expression of our belief, "He shall come to judge the quick and the dead," or the fuller form, "He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, Whose kingdom shall have no end." Not only in our creeds, but in our daily act of praise, is the same faith expressed, "We believe that Thou shalt come to be our judge. We *therefore* (note the therefore) pray Thee help Thy servants: whom Thou hast redeemed with Thy precious blood. Make them to be numbered with Thy saints in glory everlasting." How it is all there—all our relationship to Him—past, present, future! He *has* redeemed us; He *is* our present help; He *shall* come. We are His servants who wait for the coming of our Lord. "Govern them," we say, "and lift them up for ever." "We worship Thy name, ever world without end." A service, a worship begun here, to be perfected at His Advent in the kingdom for which we profess to watch and pray. We express the faith so constantly, it runs like a subtle thread through the whole of our worship, and yet how little it is a real influential motive in the conduct of our lives! Why is it so? (Forgive me that I can only so imperfectly express what I want to say.) Partly, of course, because practically we say in our hearts, "My Lord delayeth His coming." We know that that is, almost unconsciously, our attitude; but beyond this there is that deadness, that numbness of faith, which comes from thinking of religion as a matter of forms and observances, instead of as a relationship between the soul of the individual man and the living, loving, personal God and Saviour. If you think of it for one moment, it is of the fact of the second Advent that we most speak or think; it was of the person of the coming Judge that the Apostles spoke and wrote. Take that one passage in S. John's first Epistle to which I referred, and you see it at once (1 John iii. 2), "When *He* shall appear, we shall be like *Him*, for we shall see *Him* as *He* is." Christ the Hope, Christ the Expectation, Christ the Motive, Christ the All. "We look for the Lord Jesus." "Behold I come quickly." Everything speaks of the expectation, not of a fact, but of a person. Of course there is the fact, and of the fact the suddenness, the unexpectedness have been revealed to us, but the anticipation of the fact is overshadowed by the expectation of the person.

We see this (do we not?) in our ordinary meetings. An acquaintance is coming to us, and we note the fact, and we prepare for the fact of their coming. We look forward to it, we may anticipate it with pleasurable expectation or the reverse, but after all our attitude depends upon the person. If the coming guest be a stranger, the fact of their coming is the main thought. We view it with anxiety, with shrinking, even with dislike, their coming will alter our plans, our arrangements, interfere with our comfort. But if it be a friend, one proved, one tried, valued, loved, what then? The fact is swallowed up in the coming personalty. We prepare, we long; we have no words to utter at our meeting;

we can only look into the face of our friend, and "we know even as we are known."

This was the keynote of the angelic message, "This same Jesus shall so come," and the words are but the echo of His own teaching—"I will come again and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." It is the one thought of S. Paul—"So shall we ever be with the Lord." It is the one thought of S. Peter—"The appearing of Jesus Christ, Whom having not seen, ye love." It is the one thought of the Beloved Disciple—"Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

What a life it is which we see depicted in the writings of these, the followers, the companions, the lovers of the Lord Jesus. A life of knowledge of the Son of God—nay, more, a life of living union with Him; a life of high and heavenly aspirations; a life which fulfils the words of S. Paul: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God, for ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God." What a life it is!

The foundations laid in the baptism, when was the death to sin and the resurrection with Christ; the life linked with His life, the affections crucified to the world, and ever rising to Him Who reigns above, purified in the fire of perpetual offering; the life lived in the world, but, in truth, hid with Christ, Redeemer, Friend, Guide, Solace, Sanctifier, hid with Christ in God; and so, ever filled with the longing desire for the perfect knowledge, the perfect joy of union, at that day when Christ, Who is (is now) our life, shall appear. Then shall we also appear with Him in glory, glorified in His glory, glorified in the likeness to Himself.

I think then, from what I have said, that the influence of faith in the second Advent will show itself in three ways in the soul of the believer.

(1) In deepened personal religion. Not the religion of emotion, vague, indefinite, fleeting, but the religion which involves and includes the whole offering of the whole being, the thoughts, the desires, and the will, the three faculties or functions of the individual, which though logically separable, interpenetrate each other and form the unity of our personality or self. And the self, with all its faculties, finds its ideal, its only perfect object of desire in a person—the Person of the Saviour Who shall be the Judge.

Take only the words of S. Paul—his thought is one thought—"Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." His desire "to be with Christ." His will, to bear "about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body."

That is the personal religion of an Apostle; a religion of love for a person; a religion of sacrifice for a person; a religion which culminates in the longing for the coming of a person; for in this Person he recognizes the perfection of those faculties and those qualities of which, in imperfection, he is conscious in himself.

(*a*) The thoughts of the Son of God, "I pray for them." Christ's people never absent from His thoughts, and so never absent from His all-availing intercession.

(*b*) The desires of the Son of God, "Father, I will that they whom Thou hast given Me be with Me where I am."

(*c*) The will of the Son of God, "This is the will of God, even your

sanctification." "Who loved me and gave Himself for me." The all-perfect love, prompting to the all-perfect sacrifice that the individual man, loved and redeemed, might rise again to that which he had lost, holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. "The life that I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God." "It is not I that live, but Christ that liveth in me." "Looking for the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

That this Person has come, is the foundation of his redeemed condition; that this Person is, forms the substance of his faith; that this Person shall come, is the ever-present hope and the constraining motive of the life: "Whom having not seen," he "loves," but then (oh, what a "then"!) shall we see Him "face to face." The hope constrains to effort. To be worthy of such love, to respond to such sacrifice, to be capable of holiness, to be meet for His coming, that is the desire; and so he who looks for and longs for the Advent "purifies himself even as He is pure," developing even here in earthly mould the likeness of Him for Whom he longs.

(2) The faith in the second Advent will show itself in a quickened activity. It is not merely that the believer is conscious that his Master may return at any moment; he may believe that, and the belief will, indeed, give such importance, such criticalness to each passing moment, and such value to each passing duty as no other conception can involve. But beyond this, he may have the wider faith that the coming of his Lord may be advanced, or may be hindered, by the work or by the inactivity of the members of the visible kingdom. "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done;" and on the doing of the will by the members, so that earth becomes as heaven, may depend the final coming of the King to His kingdom. They who love will long for the coming of the object of their love, and love cannot be inactive; love must work, and love will work with a new motive and a redoubled vigour as it perceives that on its activity depends the return and the triumph of Him in Whom alone it can find rest, perfection, and satisfaction. "The kingdom of God is within you." And there, in the inner life of the individual, will be witnessed the first efforts of the soul, quickened by the desire for the speedy manifestation of the king. "The gospel of the kingdom must be preached, and then shall the end come." That will be the motto; that the thought radiating from an inner devotion of those who, loving, long for His appearing. To bring all to His knowledge; to help all to the joy of knowledge, of union, of hope, of sanctification; that so He may see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied; that the days of His waiting may be over, and that He may come to a kingdom prepared for Himself. Surely that will be a motive for quickened activity, unselfish effort, fervent prayer, and ardent hope.

(3) And lastly, bear with me as I say it, faith in the second Advent will lead to a more devout use of Sacraments and a consequent progressive development of the spiritual life. For what are the Sacraments? They are the present Advents of Jesus to His people, that His people may be meet for His final Advent. In that final Advent He looks for a perfect union which shall know no break or change, and so He comes in Baptism to begin that oneness which then shall be perfected. He comes in Confirmation that we faint not, neither grow weary in the life

of witness which we have to pass through, ere He can witness that we are His when He shall come in the glory of His father and of the holy angels. He comes to us in absolution. Oh merciful and tender Advent of His love. He comes to purify and to cleanse now, because He wants us to be able to stand in His presence then. He comes, not once alone, but again and again, because the way is long, and ofttimes we fall. He pours in the oil and the wine, gives the cleansing and the strength. "When I come again," said the good Samaritan, His final Advent present to His own mind, and so the imperative thought of us to whom He ministers.

He comes to us in the blessed Sacrament, "Mild He lays His glory by;" comes to us in humility, comes to us in sacrifice, comes to us in the tenderness of His love. Why? To teach us true worship; to prepare us for His unveiled presence? Yes, that, and more than that. He comes that by communion with us He may fashion us into the likeness to Himself, that He may mould us into true holiness. He comes to us that we may come to Him; He comes to us now, that we may be ready for His coming at that day, the full import of which to us He alone knows. He would have all ready, all prepared, all sanctified; and so in His Church He comes, and each coming is one step, one movement onward, in the road that leads to His final Advent.

If only we recognized this loving preparation of our King, how devoutly should we use those Sacraments in which faith, quickened by love, discerns His presence!

His Presence; His Advent. Yes, there is the one thought. Life begun, continued, and ended in Him—in Him Who has come, does come, will come. Oh! how changed our life would be, how heavenly, how spiritual, if only our faith were real; how purified the desires, how high the aspirations, how zealous the effort! "Behold, I come quickly." "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I WILL put before you briefly one or two simple thoughts which have occurred to me during the reading of the papers which we have listened to with so much pleasure, and, I trust, with edification.

One thought that has occurred to me is this—that our Divine Master Himself in those wonderful parables in which He speaks of Himself as going away, that is to say, in bodily presence, to return by-and-by, lays before us, I think I might say exclusively, the idea of duty. We are to be ready for His return, and in the meanwhile we are to work for Him, so that upon His return we shall be glad to render Him our account. He speaks not at all of feeling, but he speaks of duty. While He is absent you and I have talents committed to our charge, and it is our duty to use the talents committed to our charge, and it is our duty to use the talents intrusted to us for the development of our qualities and our moral character. Feeling the Divine Lord keeps in the background. It is not until we come to the time of the Apostles that we find the thought put forward that we naturally should look forward to the return of our Divine Master with much joy. "Rejoice in the Lord," says the Apostle, "for the Lord is at hand." "We shall be caught up to meet

the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

Ah, I can understand right well how it was that the thought of the personal return of the Saviour filled those early disciples with so much joy. We know that it was so. The early Church did not encourage its disciples to look forward to death. They were not prepared for death. The thought of death was kept completely in the background. They were to expect the second coming of their dear Lord, and that thought to them was a thought of supreme joy. They had seen the miseries of heathenism. They had seen all the sorrow, all the vice, all the hideous abomination of the heathen world. They themselves had been delivered from sin, and had learnt to rejoice in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and so they loved their Lord with a deep and fervent personal joy, and the thought of His return made them happy. Yes, must it not be so? When separated from those we fondly love, how eagerly do we rush to their embrace when the period of absence is over. See the dear schoolboy, when the holidays come round, springing into the arms of the mother whom he loves. See the missionary, who has been long years abroad, with what eagerness will he run to the parents from whom he has been so long separated, and for whom his heart has been yearning in distant climes. So, if we love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth, if we have a real personal love for Him, we shall assuredly expect and look forward with eager longing to the time when we shall see Him face to face. Let us, then, if we feel that we do not desire the Second Coming of our dear Lord, and if we do not look forward with the same joy to the time of His coming as did those early Christians of old, just do what lies within us to cultivate personal love towards our dear Lord Jesus Christ.

I will only, by way of conclusion, touch upon two thoughts. One is this. Let us think more of Jesus Christ, meditate more upon Him, and be more with Him in personal communion. I believe that a great deal of our modern religion is too much a religion of self, too much a religion of self-analysis, too much a religion of self-introspection. It is well to us to look to ourselves, that we may realize our sinfulness; but we must not stop there, but from ourselves we must ever look to God and our dear Lord Jesus Christ. It would be well for many of us to practise more systematically and devoutly the Divine science of meditation, and to meditate upon the words of Holy Scripture, and especially upon the words of our dear Lord Jesus Christ. In the Gospels, as you know, we have a photograph of our dear Lord and Master. Let us learn to look more habitually upon His likeness as exhibited to us in the pages that cannot die; for the more we look upon Him the more we shall love Him, for He is One Who is altogether lovely. The more we think of the Lord Jesus Christ, the more we meditate upon the Lord Jesus Christ, His life, His work, and His love, the more we hold communion with Him in fervent private devotion, the more, believe me, we shall learn to appreciate Him and to love Him.

And, lastly, let me put this thought before you. Is it not a truth that we must face—and which, I think, has not been put forward this morning—that the fervour of our love towards the Lord Jesus Christ must depend inevitably upon the depth of our realization of our own sin? It is they who have most deeply realized their sin, and who have

realized the blessed fact that they have been saved from their sins by our dear Lord and Master, and who are full of love and gratitude for pardon and peace bestowed, who will have a fervent personal love to Jesus. This is the teaching of our Lord Himself, is it not?—that personal love to Him is the result or consequence of the realization of the forgiveness of sin. "To whom little is forgiven"—that is to say, to him to whom there is but small realization of forgiven sin—"the same loveth little." Those words remind us—do they not?—of the life of the Magdalen. We see her devotion to her Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—how it was exhibited in her life of service; how she went about with Him loving to take care of Him and to minister to Him in all His sorrows and all His needs. We know the explanation, do we not? It was out of her that Jesus had cast seven devils. He had delivered her from pain and fearful carnal sin; and, knowing that her sins were forgiven, having in her poor soul the blessed peace which passeth all understanding, she loved her Saviour with the love of fervent gratitude. She was the one, therefore, to give Him the service of her life; and in the hour of His need and desolation, when all His Apostles had left Him and fled, we see the gratitude of Mary Magdalen as she stands beneath the Cross of her dying Lord Who had cast out of her the seven devils.

Then comes the thought of what I may call the second Advent of the Lord Jesus: I mean the time of His resurrection from the grave. May we not, without any impropriety of speech, speak of that as His second Advent, inasmuch as His pure soul was called from the place of departed spirits and entered again into His immaculate body; and do we not know to whom it was that, at that second Advent of His, He first appeared? Not to the beloved disciple, not to His Holy mother; but to Mary Magdalen, the pardoned penitent, the grateful sinner. Yes; her sins which were many had been forgiven, and so she loved much. It was upon her ear that there first fell the tones of the voice of Jesus risen. It was her voice that first fell upon the ear of the risen Saviour. May we not learn something from that? Yes; we may learn the way to attain to a fervent love, the love of gratitude for the Lord Jesus Christ; such a love as will cause us to hail with delight the thought of His personal coming. That love is bestowed upon those who realize their sins, and realize that in Jesus and by Jesus their sins have been forgiven.

Then let us ask God to give us a deeper sense of our sins, that through a deepened sense of our sins we may the more realize the love of Jesus; and our whole moral and spiritual being, being penetrated by the love of the Divine Master, we shall now work for Him in the time of His absence and strive to employ all our talents for His glory. And when He does, indeed, appear again to us, as He appeared to Mary Magdalen of old, He will call us by name, as He called her, for "He knows His own sheep by name," and we shall fall before Him and be permitted to clasp His knees with the cry of perfect joy, "Rabboni!"

AGRICULTURAL HALL.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 11TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

THE LORD'S DAY.

(1) SUNDAY OCCUPATION.
(2) OPENING OF MUSEUMS, &c.

PAPERS.

JOHN MURRAY, Esq., Albemarle Street, London.

THERE are at least three aspects in which this question may be considered.

(1) That which I may call the *Physiological*, which is concerned with the bodily health.

(2) That of the *Secularist*, whose aim is simply pleasure—amusement; these two cover much of the same ground, but are by no means identical.

(3) The *Christian* point of view, which embraces most of the aims of the other two, but adds to them and elevates them by a Divine sanction. It has for its object health, not of body alone, but of body and soul, and pleasure—or rather I would say recreation in its best and truest sense—that pleasure which does not bring fatigue, but refreshment.

Here at this Congress I may venture to assume that we propose to discuss the question of Sunday occupations from the point of view of those who "profess and call themselves Christians," not as members of any particular Church or sect, but on the broad grounds of our common Christianity.

It would be a very interesting subject for discussion to trace the various vicissitudes through which our Sunday has passed during close on nineteen centuries before it reaches us—the public enactments, the ecclesiastical edicts, the private theories which have been enunciated.

Throughout the history of the Christian Church is found an extraordinary fluctuation of theory and of practice. A variation from the most extreme dogmatic Sabbatarianism to the utmost laxity. The main lesson to be drawn from this history on the present occasion is that legal enactments, unless backed by strong public opinion, are useless. They may remove certain temptations, they cannot make a good man.

Before coming to the practical part of my subject I must touch for a moment on a word which bears in the minds of some a polemical, if not a sinister meaning, but which represents a power that has worked mightily in this country for three centuries, and from this country has spread its influence over the greatest part of the world.

I refer to the word "Puritan." Puritanism at the outset was no fanaticism, it was the outcome of one of the greatest if most silent social revolutions which have occurred in this country. A revolution due to

familiarity with the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, which began in the days of Wiclif and gathered strength under the Tudors, by means of Cranmer's and of the Geneva Bible. It was the Puritan spirit which made the language and imagery of the Bible the familiar tongue of the people. It was the Puritan spirit which, in the name of all that was most sturdy and most robust in the national character, protested against the enervating and deteriorating influences, first of Italy and then of France. It was the Puritan spirit which inspired Bunyan and Milton and in later years formed the basis of the power of the Wesleys.

The hypocrisy and cant with which some persons will always associate the word "Puritan" were due to later developments and accretions. The fault of these stern and gloomy Christians was their endeavour to enforce on others, of a temperament different to their own, observances which, if not spontaneous and genuine, become a mockery and hypocrisy. If they, however, have helped to mar the religious zeal which they did so much to arouse, they are not alone in this respect in the Church of England. There are men at the other extreme, who by an exaggerated observance of ceremonies and forms, to an extent which, to some, appears to border on superstition, are alienating men, not only from church-going, but from the worship of God. Neither by coercion nor by ritual observances can we draw men to true religion in these days of freethought and outspoken criticism.

In the true Puritanism, then, I look for the origin of our Sunday; it has passed through many crises and undergone many changes; but as a distinguished man, recently deceased, has often said to me, "The old Puritan spirit is still deeply rooted in the English people; those who try to ignore or to oppose it make a grievous mistake."

Like most of our best and noblest institutions, our Sunday is a growth of many years, not an invention, defined and laid down by man. I do not say that it has been a perfect institution, far from it; but this I do say, that conjointly with our home life (and the two are inseparable) it has been the envy of serious and thoughtful Frenchmen and Germans; and to quote the words of a well-known American, "I am no fanatic, I hope, as to Sunday, but I look abroad over the map of popular freedom in the world, and it does not seem to me accidental that . . . the countries which best observe Sunday constitute almost the entire map of safe popular government."

How have we in our generation dealt with this precious heritage?

Under the influence of our Queen and the Prince Consort we have for close on two generations seen a Court life which, in the matter of Sunday observance, as in so many other things, in spite of

> "That fierce light which beats upon a throne
> And blackens every blot,"

has been beyond criticism. This is a privilege which we can hardly over-rate.

Among our bishops and clergy we have seen a revival of zeal and devotion which is perhaps unequalled; many men of all shades of opinion, widely differing from one another, have shown what our grand Church services are capable of when inspired with the true force of sympathetic, God-fearing ministry; we have seen a distinct increase in the number of communicants of all classes, but we have also seen as distinct a relaxation in the practice of church-going, especially among the middle classes and lower classes in towns.

Some may say, if church-going is a mere conventionality it is better that it should cease. I do not agree in this. Those who go to church for mere conventional reasons are, to use an American phrase, "the men on the fence," they are nearer to hearty church-goers than those who do not go at all.

The inquiry into Sunday occupations is a most difficult and baffling one. In very few cases can a hard and fast line be drawn between right and wrong; it is in the main a consideration of use and abuse, of excess and defect; the otherwise harmless amusement of one individual or one class, may involve the hardship, one may almost say the thraldom, of another individual or another class. No law could be framed which would apply with fairness and equality to any six persons in this room.

There are some, I know, who in their intense reverence for the Lord's day would dismiss from it all but the more serious pursuits and meditations. For such opinions, genuinely held, consistently carried out, I have the deepest respect, but I must at once say that I cannot share this view as desirable, or even practicable for Christians generally in these days.

The view I would venture to uphold is that Sunday should be a day of rest from worldly toil, a day of recreation (as distinct from mere amusement) of mind and body, a day for affording wholesome joy to others; but, above all, as the motive, and spirit, and basis of all these, a day of worship. Therein only lies the key to the whole position.

In a brief survey like this, of a very large and complicated question, I believe the most practical method will be for me to suggest certain rules which should govern all Christian men and women in their Sunday recreations, and to test some of the more popular forms of Sunday amusement by them.

(1) These amusements should in no case be allowed to interfere either in a man's own case or that of others, with the chief purpose of the day, which is worship.

(2) They should entail as little labour on others as possible.

(3) They should not set a bad example.

(4) They should lead to refreshment of mind and body, and should not leave a man or woman tired and fagged.

Now there has undoubtedly been an increase in the custom of giving dinner-parties on Sundays, I mean fashionable, so-called "smart" dinner-parties. There are many who have a good plain meal on Sunday, a meal involving little extra trouble, and issue a general invitation to poorer relations or those who are living alone, away from their homes. These, of course, I do not class with the others.

These smart dinner-parties involve much extra work on servants. I know of households where, during the London season, servants as a rule never get out on Sundays. It is to Christians alone that one can make this appeal, both on the score of giving unnecessary work to others, and of setting a bad example; but if a man be a Christian, if, with S. Paul, we judge that no man put a stumbling-block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way, then, I say, there can be no two opinions on this subject—these smart dinner-parties must be wrong.

There is no game which has made such inroads on our Sundays in recent times as golf. I have been a golfer for over twenty-five years, and have watched the extraordinary spread of the game in the South.

Under certain restrictions it seems to me that there is no game better suited for quiet recreation, but in few cases that I know of are these limitations observed.

There should, in my opinion, be no employment of caddies on Sunday; play should not commence till after a fixed hour; luncheons, etc., should not be served at the club-house; and play for stakes or money should in every way be discouraged.

I have heard of a quiet country town being invaded on Easter morning by brakes full of golfers driving from the station on their way to the links as people were going to church. I have myself been at service on Good Friday in a town full of golfing visitors, most of whom I knew by sight, and not one of whom had attended Divine service.

These things I call a scandal. It is often pleaded that a round of golf on Sunday for the hardworked man, who can get but little or no fresh air during the week, is a harmless and healthy thing. In this I entirely concur; but it is a striking and curious fact that the enormous majority of Sunday golfers in England are men of means and leisure sufficient to enable them to play throughout the week.

In Scotland golf is the game of the artisan classes; many of the best players are those who can only get a round in the evening after their work is over, and yet Sunday play is almost unknown in Scotland.

Lawn tennis differs in some important respects from golf. It calls for the employment of fewer attendants—not necessarily of any; it is not so often played during hours of Divine service, and it is less gregarious.

Herein lies an important distinction. One of my correspondents has wisely pointed out that Sunday amusements tend to become undesirable and mischievous in proportion as they are engaged in by large numbers of persons congregated together, and *vice versa*.

If boating, bicycle-riding, and other similar sports be carried on on Sunday, the smaller the parties the better.

It is curious to note the arbitrary distinction which marks Sunday playing of games. Golf and lawn tennis are freely played; cricket very seldom; football never, as far as I know—and yet practice at cricket and kick-about football would be very suitable exercise for lads during certain hours. Hockey is played on the ice, but not on land as a rule; fives and racquets (which call for no more attendance than golf), never. Many a man will play a round of golf for a stake of say £1, who would not play billiards or whist. I am glad that some distinctions, however slight, are observed, as they are an indication that some forms of respect for public opinion—if not for the Lord's Day—still survive.

I have little doubt that that which has made the widest inroads into Sunday observance is the bicycle. "The bicycle," said the late Bishop of Winchester, "has revolutionized the English Sunday," and I know that in Scotland it is having an astonishing effect. As a cheap and pleasant mode of locomotion it is unequalled, and one can well sympathize with the lads and men who, shut up in towns all the week, yield to the fascination of spending the whole day in the open air, seeing new districts and creating new interests.

Many a country clergyman has made use of the country excursions of bicycle clubs to show them his church, to hold brief services for them (at which in some cases one of their own members is asked to

read the lessons, or to play the organ). Much may be done in this way to guide into useful channels a movement which cannot now be checked; much may be done in towns by the clergy and their fellow workers, by becoming members of the bicycle clubs in their parishes and districts, by finding out where the Sunday excursionists propose to go, and by apprising the clergy in that district, and thus arranging for services, etc., at convenient hours.

But there remains a vast majority whose Sunday bicycle excursions are without any thought of Divine service. The large bodies of cyclists who go together, the assembling at roadside inns; the emulation of "record breaking" and of long-distance excursions, leaving the riders fagged and exhausted on Monday morning (for bicycling in excess is a peculiarly exhausting form of exercise); these are real and increasing dangers to which we must not close our eyes. I know of many cases in Scotland where farm labourers frequently come back late on Sunday night from long bicycle excursions, so worn out that they are unfit for work on Monday.

From more than one quarter my correspondents tell me of young men who used to sing in the choir, but now rarely appear in Church, owing to their bicycles.

In old days when Saturday half-holidays were not the rule there was more excuse for a godless Sunday than there is now, but now almost all those classes to which bicyclists belong have their regular Saturday half-holiday in which to obtain recreation.

So far I have spoken of the occupations of those who have more or less leisure on Sunday. What shall be said of those tens of thousands of dwellers in the lower parts of our large cities to whom Sunday is a day of joyless, grimy desolation?

In many a district of London (such, *e.g.*, as Walworth and Battersea) the poor livers from hand to mouth with their newly-paid weekly wages are laying in their small stores of provisions up to midnight on Saturday. It is one o'clock on Sunday morning before the shopkeepers get their shops closed and their tills counted. By nine o'clock on Sunday morning the sellers of perishable goods are again at work selling by auction what remains of the previous day's stock. Now comes the chance of the poorest buyers. They may get a chance of well-thumbed portions of meat, etc., for a few pence, and so the morning of the Lord's Day is spent in bartering for the necessaries of life.

How can these poor people conceive of, or take part in the higher lawful recreations of Sunday? Their souls, and minds and bodies could not appreciate them if they were within their reach. To many of them a day in the country apart from a public-house would be a day of boredom.

Noble work, as we all know, is being done among them by the clergy and their associates How far the evil can be mitigated by a change of pay-day, so that wages shall not be paid on Saturday, I cannot say. The subject is too large and too intricate to be dealt with here, even if I were capable of dealing with it.

I mention the subject chiefly as showing what a vast opening for Sunday occupation for wealthy and leisured Christians lies open at their own doors, if they will give up a few hours occasionally, and put

themselves in the hands of those societies and organizations which are working among the poor of our great cities.

I must now say a few words of those on whom the Sunday amusements—harmless Sunday amusements—of the masses entails a day of exceptional toil.

One of the witnesses examined before the Select Committee of the House of Lords (which has recently been sitting to investigate the question of Sunday amusements) made a most remarkable statement, which was repeated by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the Canterbury Diocesan Conference. It was this: "That the most miserable life on earth, and the one in which a man could do least for his own family and for his own soul, was that of an omnibus driver."

Nothing can seem more harmless and innocent to a dweller in a town than an omnibus ride on Sunday, but we see how even this recreation reacts on a very hardworking and deserving class. Nay, more; I have heard on the best authority that when Mr. Spurgeon used to preach at the Tabernacle, the vast crowds who went to hear him very seriously increased the labours of the omnibus and tramcar drivers. So even church-going may work its own hardships.

It would be impossible now to put a stop to Sunday trains, but a distinction should be drawn between the few which are run for necessary communication and the increasing number which are being put on for the benefit of shareholders. Anyone who has been at Paddington or Waterloo on a summer Sunday morning will know what an enormous throng of smart, well-to-do people congregate there, on these occasions, bound for the river, and bent solely on amusement. The number of Sunday trains is the point to be watched; this should not be allowed to increase, and I would suggest that Sunday excursion trains should be strictly limited, and the tickets sold during the previous week.

Some will answer me that the railway porter, the engine driver, and 'bus and tramcar man, if he works on Sundays, gets a compensating holiday in the week. From the Secularist point of view this answer is, no doubt, satisfactory; but I am endeavouring to-day to plead for the Christian cause, and from our point of view I say a week-day holiday is no compensation.

We, the better educated, the well-to-do, the more leisured, are in a very definite sense our brothers' keepers, and we ought to see to it, so far as we can, that our less favoured brother is enabled and encouraged, not only to rest, but to worship.

Sunday harvesting is a much debated question. In cases of real emergency, where the saving of a crop depends on a day, I would suggest that the work be done, always provided that a special service for all the workers be held during the day in the fields.

In touching on the question of consideration for the Sunday of subordinates, there is one little point which I should like to mention. It may seem a trifle to many of you.

The Sunday "long-lie" in the morning is a British tradition. We all know how we prized it at school, but do we ever consider how the practice of breakfasting late on Sundays hinders our servants from going to church—gives them a plausible excuse, if no more. I believe this is of more importance than may be supposed.

So much for the restrictive or negative side of Sunday occupations.

I must not leave unnoticed the more positive side of the question—the occupation of those who desire, not merely to do no harm, but seek to do some actual positive good.

First among these—among laymen and women—undoubtedly comes Sunday school teaching, perhaps one of the highest and best pursuits when well and efficiently and conscientiously carried out, which is open to the leisured classes. It is, however, a work not to be enterprised lightly or unadvisedly. If badly done (and it is, alas! too often badly done) it is scarcely better than nothing. If well done, it requires diligence, labour, tact, and force of character. It requires close and wearying work on Sundays, and much extraneous work during the week.

One of my most influential correspondents writes:—"The Sunday schools should be broken up and re-constructed on the day school lines. I would make a strong point of re-constructing, modernizing, and in a sense glorifying the Sunday school."

Another writes:—"Sunday school teaching in itself, or taking classes, or interesting one's self in some form of religious work, will always take more time than any man or woman can give, if done properly. Real teachers won't complain of too much leisure; the trouble is some teachers think that taking a Sunday class consists in meeting the children once a week in the Sunday school. I consider that if a man takes a Sunday school class he should lay himself out to be with the children as much as possible both on Sunday and in the week. To many very poor children a teacher is the one representative of God's love they have access to, and they will pretty soon find out whether their teacher loves them enough to seek their company out of school, and they will not be slow to respond to it."

Truly this is a great vocation and a great privilege, but it is also a great tax on those who have other and heavy vocations to fulfil.

There is many a young man and woman who desires to do some good work on Sundays, but who naturally shrinks from this great and continuous undertaking, with its heavy responsibility. In writing to my correspondents I have endeavoured to obtain hints as to some less arduous occupations which might be suggested to those who wish to employ their Sunday leisure in some good work of a less exacting and binding character.

Here are some of them:—

Lecturing to mens', lad's, and boy's clubs and classes. I know how kindly even feeble efforts of this kind are welcomed. Endless subjects suggest themselves. I would specify only one, to those who are competent—the accounts of recent discoveries in Biblical lands, and the astonishing confirmatory light which they throw on the Bible narrative.

Walking with one or two lads, talking to them on such subjects as natural history, foreign travel, and the like.

The systematic study of the Bible, and of the subsequent history of Christ's Church on earth. If parties of three or four can be formed to carry on this work together, so much the better.

Visiting the poor and lonely, reading to those who are bed-ridden, asking those who are solitary and away from home to spend the day in the home circle.

Writing letters to distant friends who long for news of home, and to whom such letters are a real boon.

Children should, above all, be taught that Sunday is a day of worship, of joy, of recreation, but not of idleness. They should be encouraged to read good and instructive books of whatever class, and to put aside all that are merely frivolous. They should be allowed to work, provided the work is useful, and for some good and unselfish object. They, and not they only, but everyone who desires to spend Sunday aright, should endeavour, on that day at any rate, to perform, unseen and "unadvertized," some act of self-denial or self-control.

It is a notable fact worth pondering over, that no human being probably ever performed a quiet, unostentatious act of self-denial without feeling the better for it; certainly no one ever regretted such an act..

Above all—and on this I would lay the utmost stress—Sunday should be the day above all others for the cultivation of home life. Almost without exception my correspondents have laid paramount stress on this point. Home life has been the keynote to the best and most envied type of English character. It is inseparably associated with our Sunday, and there are but too many symptoms that the sanctity of both are now in imminent peril.

In many cases home influence is in danger of being reversed. An American preacher has said, "How to train up a parent in the way he should go is the assiduous care of the younger members of too many of our households."

I have said, and I must repeat it in conclusion, for it is my very deep and heartfelt belief, that the key to Sunday well spent is the true spirit of worship.

There has been a great and steady growth in personal religion in our times, our missionaries to the heathen in our own large cities are teaching their converts the value of public worship; but are those of our own station—are the upper and middle classes—those who set the example and are looked up to, alive to the vital importance of this question.

Even if we do our utmost to keep our eyes and our thoughts fixed in church, we cannot but see the irreverent postures, the inattentive demeanour of too many of our fellow worshippers.

While men and women, who would blush to be found committing some breach of the etiquette which surrounds an earthly court, or is ordained by society, are to be seen, weekly, lolling about during the services, sitting during the prayers (and not only of the old and infirm is this true, but of the young and active), while we see churches depleted by a shower of rain which would not leave vacant one seat at a dinner-party or a theatre or a concert; while we find people habitually coming to service late, and entering their seats, perhaps while the Confession is being said; while we find the Sunday morning services made into a sort of competitive show of smart bonnets and new dresses—while these things are seen by every one of us, believe me there is something wrong in our sense of public worship.

If we are not downright hypocrites when we come to church—to repeat our belief in God our Creator and our Saviour—if there is one grain of truth in our glib assertion that to Him we owe our life and breath and all things, and that our lives are in His hands, then can we come to His house on His day and behave as if we were doing Him a favour in thus coming?

Who of us has not been at a fashionable marriage and seen the

Church thronged with a gay crowd chatting and joking—even standing on the seats to catch a glimpse of their friends? Can we say that these people believe that they are taking part in one of the most solemn ceremonies of our Church? Far be it from me to say one word in disparagement of fine music or of preaching: they are the highest accessories of and helps to public worship: but when we find—as we do so often find—men and women habitually talking of "going to hear" this or that popular preacher, or going to this or that church "because the music is so lovely," then I repeat there is some serious lack in our religion.

I believe this arises mainly from want of instruction in the real purpose and beauty of our Church services. Our children are not sufficiently taught, either by precept or example, the reverence due to the public worship of God. I have attended frequently at services where the incumbent, in order to abbreviate the morning prayers (when the Litany was not read), stopped short after the third Collect, so that our worship contained no prayer for all sorts of conditions of men, no prayer for our country and rulers, and no thanksgiving. Could anyone offer us such a maimed and imperfect service if they had given the matter a moment's careful consideration?

Our Book of Common Prayer is so familiar to many who have never been led to study the real import of the words that the prayers pass by them unheeded. If any unusual incident occurs, if some member of the congregation is prayed for, or returns thanks, we feel at once by the sudden hush that attention is aroused. The rapidly increasing popularity of "Watch Night" services, and the large and attentive congregations which may be seen at them, show how ready people are to respond to an idea which commends itself to them.

Many of us must have felt the want of some elasticity in our services, especially, for example, at a time like the recent election, when all serious men were praying God to direct the minds of the electors.

How often, too, the sermon, which should be the most powerful and moving incentive to public worship, utterly fails of its mark. There are few greater stumbling-blocks in our Church than the dull, platitudinous sermon to which we are too often condemned. One of my correspondents has urged strongly that we have too much preaching. I do not think we have too much *good* preaching, but I do honestly believe that we have too much commonplace, pointless, monotonous preaching, and I would endorse the words of another of my advisers:—"Nothing is more attractive than a bright spiritual address, only you must get the right man to deliver it. In my judgment, what we want in the Church of England is the resuscitation of the Order of Evangelists. A good pastor is often a bitterly bad preacher, and it is purgatory to sit and listen to a man mumbling out some written sermon without emotion or change of voice. By all means let the vicar be head, but let the bishop license not only lay readers, but a distinct Order of Lay Evangelists, who should not occasionally, but as a rule, do the preaching for the clergyman, except in such cases as he had a special faculty himself in that direction. I should look upon bad preaching—that is to say, expecting a man to be a good preacher as well as a good pastor and organizer—as the main cause of falling off in church attendance."

What our national character owes to our Sunday no man can

estimate; that its invigorating wholesome influence has been of incalculable value I say without hesitation. I believe if our fellow countrymen could be polled that an enormous majority would be in favour of upholding it as a day of rest from toil, of recreation (not merely of amusement), and, above all, of worship.

But those who are making inroads on it are active, noisy, plausible, too often influential. It is not by shouting and opposition, not by legal enactments, that we can hope to win, but only by living up to our ideal of the Lord's Day.

There is no man or woman in this room who cannot in this great cause exercise a strong personal influence.

FREDK. SHERLOCK, Esq., Editor of *The Church Monthly*, New Bridge Street, Ludgate Circus, E.C.

THE place which Literature fills in the Sunday occupation of the masses largely depends upon environment. There is a vast difference between peaceful Addington and populous Whitechapel. A working man, dwelling "far from the madding crowd," with nothing to disturb his Rest Day quiet but the singing of the birds, is, after a week of laborious toil, hardly likely of his own volition to bother his mind with books or papers on the one day in the week on which he feels free to "do nothing, like the master!" whereas one whose lot it is to spend his days in the over-crowded town, and to be music-waked by the strident voice of the leather-lunged newsvendor, is pretty certain to part with a penny for his Sunday newspaper, and thus to occupy a fair slice of the day in reading the more or less sensational doings of the week, chiefly in so far as they relate to his favourite sport, and to the unsavoury records of the criminal courts.

However much we may lament the circumstance, the fact remains, and in any consideration of the subject it is well to bear this in mind. We must remember that the Church rightly claims to be concerned with the entire population—the non-church-goers equally with the church-goers. It need scarcely be said that to the former the Bible, the Prayer-book, and the hymn-book have no attractions as Sunday literature; and until we succeed in transplanting men and women from the non-church-going to the church-going class, we must reluctantly admit that if they read at all, the Sunday newspaper will be a staple element in their literary bill of fare.

The Sunday newspapers have, to use a current phrase, "come to stay." They are to a large extent the poor man's university, and the best of them are certainly marvellous productions for a penny. It is useless for the Church to lead a crusade against them, and we must expect the Sunday newspapers to be purchased, and purchased largely, whenever leaders of Cabinets have the hardihood to try their luck at the polls on sunny Saturday afternoons at Derby! Still, there is no need to rush into a panic about the baneful influence of these Sunday papers, an influence which is sometimes greatly exaggerated.

There are only about a dozen newspapers published in the United Kingdom on Sunday, most of them in London, and it is well to remember that several of these papers are really simply Saturday papers

with Sunday morning editions. We know, of course, that in many homes the local weekly paper published on a Friday or a Saturday is piously put by with the best bonnet and top hat for Sunday use. The great bulk of these papers are at present utterly indifferent to religious topics, while several of them are bitterly hostile to the Church. It should be the mission of Churchmen to win over the Editors to our side, and also to leave no stone unturned to reduce the Sunday labour employed in the production and distribution of these papers to the smallest possible point. Happily, some of the London newsvendors are taking united action in this direction. Last year they sent a deputation to the Archbishop of Canterbury, asking His Grace to help them in their endeavour to obtain a day of rest on Sunday. In the words of their spokesman, they want "one day's rest every week," and to attain this they want the Sunday morning newspapers to be published on Saturday night. The proprietors of the *Weekly Dispatch* have recently made this alteration, but how far their example will be followed remains to be seen. At his recent Diocesan Conference the Archbishop of Canterbury referred in terms of deep sympathy to the newsvendor, and described his "life from Saturday night to Saturday night as really a life of misery and oppression." "The time must come," said the Archbishop, "when there will be some interference, some regulations to provide that men must have at any rate every alternate Sunday to themselves, and anyhow one day's rest in the week."

For nearly five years *Lloyd's News* has regularly published every week a sermon specially contributed to its columns by a bishop or some leading dignitary of the Church. The *Daily Chronicle* waits until Monday morning, and then publishes what it terms the "Sermon of the Week." It is worth noting that despite the aggressive attitude of this paper towards the Church, "The Sermon of the Week" is usually by one of our own men, a significant tribute to the pulpit oratory of the clergy. Now that these great London papers have set the fashion, it ought not to be difficult to get an entrance into the columns of many of the leading country papers. This can best be done on the spot. Every paragraph or column of religious matter or Church news which we can get published in this way clearly displaces something of a secular character, and to this extent "makes for righteousness."

Of course some will say the sermons printed in newspapers are rarely read; and one might as well retort that the sermons preached in church are rarely listened to! The printed sermon, anyhow, has this advantage over the spoken one—a man may read it if he will, while the spoken sermon sometimes fails to reach the "dear hearer," owing to the spiritless, depressing delivery of its accomplished author!

It is well known that there are hundreds of Sunday newspapers in America. In a speech lately given at Toronto, Mr. D. L. Moody said, "I believe the greatest curse we have in America to-day is our Sunday newspapers." The production and publication of newspapers on the Day of Rest has for some time engaged the serious attention of the American clergy. Side by side with an energetic effort to discountenance this Sunday labour, there has recently developed an organized attempt to permeate these newspapers with religious teaching. As might be anticipated, this is to be done in a characteristic American fashion. A "Newspaper Sermon Association" has been formed at Boston, with all

the paraphernalia of President, Committee, Secretaries, etc., and one gentleman has promised a substantial contribution towards the work, being, to quote his own words, "desirous of bringing Gospel truth home to the millions who will not go to church to hear it." For my own part I do not recommend any associated action in this country, although I have long been of the opinion that the clergy might do a great service for the Church by genially cultivating the friendship of newspaper editors. I would say to the clergy, If there is a local newspaper in the parish, do not think it too much trouble to keep the editor posted up with details of the Church work which is going on. If he is on principle opposed to the National Church, you will possibly, on occasion, find your "withers wrung" by his fiery editorials. Please don't sit down in a rage and pen him a severely sarcastic remonstrance. It "never pays" to fall out with an editor, for he can always have the last word, and score off your letter by adding two lines of editorial wisdom in black letter capitals. No, there is, as Mrs. Glasse says in her famous cookery book, "another way." Take the enemy by guile. Thank him for giving the wide publicity of his columns to Church matters, and politely point out that there is a slight error in his argument. In nine cases out of ten you will succeed in making him your friend, and before long he will be writing of you in his columns as "our valued correspondent, the energetic vicar." When the editor knows that he numbers among his "constant readers" the clergy of the parish, you may depend upon it there will be a perceptible toning up of the paper all round. Moreover, in writing to the newspaper, remember that the short letter, like the short sermon, often makes the most abiding impression. Go straight to the point, and put your rhetorical flourishes on one side; they will keep without spoiling for the next parish tea party. Of course in all matters of public controversy, more particularly in newspaper warfare, it is well to keep Bishop Thorold's sagacious advice in mind, "When you have nothing to say, don't say it."

Next in importance to the producers of literature are its vendors. The clergy should therefore aim at being in touch with the booksellers and newsvendors in their parishes. If the parson pays unexpected visits to the shops, he will do much to stamp out the plague of bad literature; for in spite of the cheap sneers of the enemies of the Church, the average Englishman has still a fair amount of respect "for the cloth." Few things are more to be regretted than the prominent place given in the windows of the news-shops in poor neighbourhoods to trashy publications with their brutalising pictures of revolting scenes. Small crowds seem to be always clustering round these windows on fine Sunday mornings, gazing at the realistic illustrations of "The Suspected Governess; or, Shadowed to Doom," "Spring-heeled Jack," "Deadwood Dick," etc. This kind of Sunday free art gallery certainly needs some attention, and possibly if the local clergy would quietly take the matter in hand, and even go to the trouble of providing the shopkeeper with a small supply of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge "penny tales" as a start, a speedy change for the better might be effected. While it is not prudent to put all the eggs in one basket, there are advantages in cultivating the sympathy of at least one bookseller in the parish, so that his place becomes known as the church shop, and the

recognized depôt for Bibles, Prayer-books, hymn-books, and other Church literature.

It is the fashion in some quarters to speak disparagingly of tracts, but I am satisfied that the old plan of a systematic distribution of tracts from door to door on a Sunday afternoon is well worth reviving. These homely messengers, lent on one Sunday and exchanged on the following Sunday, may be the means of untold good; at any rate, they are a perpetual reminder to the receivers that the Church remembers them, and that the Church recognizes that she has a mission to them. A common objection to the use of tracts is, that the fate of the great bulk of those given away is to be immediately destroyed, mostly by burning, possibly because they are so dry. I know of one case however, where a good old dame—"she had a frugal mind"—evinced a great desire to receive her tract regularly. By-and-by, when she was laid up, the vicar in his pastoral visitation discovered that the bedroom of the poor old body was in a half-finished state of mural decoration, the picture tracts having been cleverly used for wall paper, and the room being about three-parts done. A thrifty Surrey housewife has hit upon another use for tracts. The other day she addressed a note to a friend of mine, a country rector who goes in for "poultry keeping," intimating that she would be pleased to send him a large packet of devotional tracts, in exchange for a dozen new laid eggs.

In some parishes tract distribution is obviously paralysed by the migratory character of the population, and in most cases the initial difficulty is that which meets us in every department of Church work—the great lack of voluntary helpers. Even in well-to-do parishes the tract distribution is worth an effort, as a ready means of reaching that greatly neglected class, the domestic servants. According to the report of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, no less than 5,104,035 tracts were circulated by the venerable society last year; and during the same period the Religious Tract Society circulated 17,970,850 tracts. I was anxious to ascertain whether the demand for tracts was on the decline, and accordingly sent enquiries to the Rev. E. McClure and the Rev. J. P. Hobson, the respective representatives of these great societies. Mr. McClure has been too busy to answer, but Mr. Hobson writes:—

"I think we can safely say that the demand for tracts has largely increased during the last twenty years. Our grants, though not so large as they might be, for lack of funds, have increased, and many other agencies are at work distributing tracts. In connection with our grants it is interesting to know that they are all applied for. We do not send people tracts and ask them to distribute them. I should say that my opinion is that people do not care for the word 'tract,' and do not care for the ordinary tract shape; but I think there is an increasing demand for short religious publications."

No doubt some of the ill-favour with which the word "tract" is received is due to the fact that some tract writers habitually wear their hearts upon their sleeves, and are always ready to lead their readers to have what our sisters call "a good cry." To write a robust tract is nearly as difficult a task as to write a good hymn; but happily the Church still commands the services of gifted sons and daughters with brains enough and grip enough to be safely entrusted with this honourable work.

The Sunday literature of the regular church-goers obviously stands upon an entirely different footing to that of the non-church goers. At the same time there are many ways in which the influence of the clergy may be wisely exercised. I am not going to suggest that there should be a pure literature Sunday in every parish, for Sundays are not, like special objects, unlimited in number; there are only fifty-two Sundays in most years; and I know that there is a growing feeling among the laity that we have too many societies overlapping each other's work, and clamouring for contributions which might more fittingly be devoted to the augmentation of the stipends of the hard-working and miserably underpaid clergy. It is an open question whether these special objects would not gain greater support by having their work mentioned incidentally in an unexpected fashion, than is the case when the "beloved brethren" know, before the preacher opens his mouth, the object for which the appeal is to be specially made.

Without at all giving up a special Sunday to the claims of pure literature, the clergy may help the laity considerably by an occasional reference in the sermon to the necessity of looking after the home reading, or by a directing hint as to the value of a new book when it first breaks upon the literary world. Instead of indulging in scathing denunciations of the latest society novel, and thus giving the dangerous book a magnificent advertisement, the preacher may best serve the cause of pure literature by severely ignoring these insidious morbid productions, and giving instead a little generous praise to any book really helpful to holy living which he has come across in his week-day reading.

Then, again, it might be worth while to ascertain if every house in the parish has a Bible, Prayer-book, and hymn-book. Much as we boast of our country as the home of open Bibles, I fear that a house-to-house canvass would show the nakedness of the land in this respect, and yet what a tribute was that which the late Professor Huxley paid the Book of Books when he said:—"Take the Bible as a whole, make the severest deductions which fair criticism can dictate for shortcomings and positive errors, and there still remains in this old literature a vast residuum of moral beauty and grandeur; and then consider the great historical fact that for three centuries this Book has been woven into the life of all that is best and noblest in English history; that it has become the national epic of Britain, and is familiar to noble and simple from John-o'Groats to Land's End; that it is written in the noblest and purest English, and abounds in exquisite beauties of a mere literary form; and, finally, that it forbids the merest hind who never left his village, to be ignorant of other countries and other civilizations, and of a great past stretching back to the furthest limits of the oldest nations of the world. By the study of what other book could children be so much humanised?"

In view of such a testimony as this, it might be well to urge church-goers to bring their Bibles to church, for it certainly would be an improvement to see the bulk of the congregation devoutly following the reading of the lessons, instead of settling themselves into the most comfortable, snoozy attitudes while the appointed portions are being read. Perhaps it was to stimulate the attention of the congregation that the curate of a fashionable London church not long ago read the

lessons from a copy of that diminutive edition of the Scriptures known as the "Thumb Bible." He certainly succeeded, for every eye seemed to be directed towards the lectern. To me not the least value of our liturgical service is that four portions of God's Book are by the Church's order daily appointed to be read. Thus the regular churchgoer has for his Sunday literature at least four specially selected portions of what Huxley himself terms "the national epic of Britain."

In London we have been suffering from an epidemic of "up-to-date preaching." And very good preaching much of it is, although some of the clergy have had the disease badly. Yet I would humbly say to the great army of preachers assembled in congress, please don't forget the old fossils. Among your regular hearers there are still a few old-fashioned codgers like myself who can stand an expository sermon once a month. We don't at all mind taking our Bibles with us to church, and we rather enjoy comparing Scripture with Scripture under your helpful guidance. To be quite frank, it is a trifle tedious to be told every Sunday about our failings as employers of labour, without so much as a reference to the failings of those to whom we give employment. It is only by faithful expository preaching that you can really drub into the minds of the laity that "Church doctrine is Bible truth."

The Sunday school may form a useful link in the propaganda of circulating Sunday literature. Scrupulous attention should be given to the selection of the books offered as prizes—for often the Sunday school prize is the commencement of a library in the home; and it is therefore well to keep up the character of the books thus circulated among the young, and which are in many cases read by their elders at home.

The circulation of magazines can readily be attached to Sunday-school work, and the members of Bible-classes may be led to take in *Good Words*, *The Quiver*, *The Fireside*, *The Sunday Magazine*, *The Monthly Packet*, *The Sunday at Home*, or such publications of a like character which commend themselves to the clergy of the parish, for it is only with the direct sanction and active co-operation of the clergy that any effort of this kind can hope for success. For very young children, it would be difficult to find anything better than the well-known and delightful little publication published by Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., entitled *Sunday*. Its charming pictures always ensure for it a hearty welcome, the reading matter is invariably wholesome, and it can be relied upon for its sound Church teaching.

It is well for Sunday-school libraries that no "New Reviewer" has at present been on tour among them, or I fear the verdict would run with that which he has just pronounced on free libraries—"dead failures!" The fact is, too many of our Sunday-school libraries are, as the Psalmist says of ourselves, "fearfully and wonderfully made." Some well-meaning, fussy individual starts the library by addressing a packet of post-cards to her friends, telling them of the effort, and asking them to send any books they have done with, and adding that such will be most thankfully received. The done-with books duly arrive in a most forlorn and melancholy condition—odd volumes of Encyclopædias, in which the science is a century old, antiquated novels long since out of date, with a few pages here and there gone a-missing, books of verse, fat, thin, oblong, square, and altogether unfitable to the new shelves. And, stay, here in this parcel from the hall are some handsome, sober-looking

volumes, in an excellent state of preservation. Ah! these are the late lamented rector's sermons, "published by request," with the pages not so much as cut. Can it be wondered at that a Sunday-school library started under such miserable conditions becomes a wretched failure? Too long the Church has suffered from the idea that anything is good enough for Church work. Too long the clergy have tolerated the cry, "Oh, any old used-up thing will do for us." Yes, and unless there is an end of this fatuous policy, it certainly will "do" for the Church in a way not to be misunderstood.

To those about to form a Sunday school library, I would say, begin with a high ideal. Pure literature does not of necessity mean poor literature. Beg books if you like, but you will find it far more satisfactory to beg the money, and then buy the best books you can, always keeping in view the special requirements of the particular parish in which the library is to be planted.

The Church Reading Unions, which have now been formed in many dioceses, deserve cordial recognition, for there can be no doubt they are exerting a most beneficial influence on the home-reading of thoughtful Church folk.

As an example of a ready way of getting into touch with a working-class congregation, I may mention that last summer the Rev. H. A. Mason, vicar of S. Stephen's, North Bow, held a series of meetings in the vicarage garden on Sunday nights, after the ordinary evening service, at which addresses were given on various phases of Church work. I was privileged to speak to the people one night on "The Church and the Press," and had an attentive hearing from three or four hundred persons.

The Sunday reading of the more educated classes has undoubtedly undergone a considerable change during the past quarter of a century. Is it quite certain that the change is for the better? In the pages of current literature one frequently meets with a gibe at the rigid observance of Sunday by our grandfathers and grandmothers, especially in this matter of Sunday reading. Writers delight to go out of their way to have a fling at the old-fashioned Sunday books, and yet it is a significant fact that when the biographer draws for us the story of some man who has had much to do with the making of the greatness of our Empire, a tribute is almost invariably paid to the quiet, sanctified Sundays which hallowed the early days of the hero.

Sunday is peculiarly and emphatically the poor man's day.

> "On other days the man of toil is doomed
> To eat his joyless bread, lonely; the ground
> Both seat and board; screened from the winter's cold
> Or summer's heat by neighbouring hedge or tree;
> But on this day, embosomed in his home,
> He shares the frugal meal with those he loves."

And the great test of our Sunday occupation is this, "How much of Heaven has it brought us, and how much of Heaven has it led us to impart to others?"

It is notorious that most parishes contain at least half-a-dozen bumptious laymen who are confidently of the opinion that they can "run the show" much better than their respective vicars. I hope I may say that I am not of the number, for happily I have never been that

nineteenth-century-legalized-ecclesiastical-monstrosity—"the aggrieved parishioner!" I feel, however, that I ought to apologize for presuming to have offered so many hints to the clergy; but we lay-folk have not many opportunities of putting our views before the cloth, and so rejoice that once a year such an occasion is given by the Church Congress.

---

(2) Opening of Museums, etc.

G. F. Chambers, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Eastbourne.*

Whether the nineteenth century people are willing to recognize the fact or not, one of their greatest needs is more rest—rest of mind and rest of body. For weal or woe we are all too busy, too restless, too much occupied, be it in money-making, in running about, in seeking pleasure, I had almost even said in good works—too many societies, committees, and public meetings. The age is one of rivalry and competition, carried too far in things religious quite as much as in things secular. I do not suggest, at any rate here, any attempt to wield Mrs. Partington's famous broom in respect of these matters, but no Churchman, minded to look at things from a practical standpoint, can doubt that if ever in the history of the human race there was a time when it was essential to keep up the spirit of the Fourth Commandment, that time is the present time. The subject, even as limited as it is to-day to museums (including picture galleries), is a wide one, and I can only hope to deal with it in outline.

One important preliminary point must, however, first be glanced at. Call it Sunday, or Sabbath, or Lord's Day, or Day of Rest, or by any other cognate name, two questions arise: (1) Where did the day come from? and (2) What are our powers and rights to interfere in the regulation of it?

I must avow at once in the plainest English that I hold the day to be one of Divine appointment; not a mere festival of the Church, not a merely Jewish, local, or ceremonial holiday, but an institution ordained by the Creator at the creation of the world, and serving the secondary purpose of commemorating that creation. In other words, the day came from God; and our Saviour has stated its design: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mark ii. 27). This is its primary purpose—the benefit of man.

Whilst the non-Mosaic origin of the Sabbath may be shown by various proofs familiar to the theologian, recent archæological discoveries in Bible lands have furnished a new and unexpected proof of quite another, but most interesting, kind. I will employ the words of the Rev. A. H. Sayce:—"The Sabbath rest was a Babylonian as well as a Hebrew institution. Its origin went back to pre-Semitic days, and the very name Sabbath, by which it was known in Hebrew, was of Babylonian origin." Further on he says, "We must, therefore, admit that we first find traces of the week of seven days, with the rest day or Sabbath which fell upon the seventh, in Babylonia, and that it was intimately

---

* The Editor finds it necessary to omit portions of Mr. Chambers' paper, owing, partly, to its extreme length.

connected with the astronomical belief in the existence of seven planets." —*The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, 3rd edition, 1894, pp. 74, 76.

If you will, therefore, accustom yourselves to regard the Lord's Day as a primæval and not a Judaic institution, you will soon see that my second question must be answered by saying that our powers and rights to interfere with the regulation of it must be deemed strictly limited to the lines laid down in what Sir Walter Scott at the closing scene of his life called "THE BOOK."

Turn, then, to "The Book," and at Exodus xx. 8-11 you have the words familiar to all. Those words (as explained and developed in Isaiah lviii. 13, 14) must, I hold, be taken by us Christians and Churchmen in 1895 in their plainest literal sense, without addition or subtraction. That this is so I argued at length at the Manchester Church Congress in 1888 and at the Cardiff Church Congress in 1889, and time fails me to go over the ground again to-day. I will content myself by saying that the very form and framework of the Fourth Commandment, coupled with the fact that it is only one out of ten such precepts, forbids altogether the idea that it is merely something Mosaic or Judaic, and therefore optional for us; whilst if you once begin to attempt to draw lines of relaxation of your own, each man will quickly drift into paths which will be no paths, but a trackless wilderness of Sunday non-observance. This is mere history; not my imagination. Depend upon it, the closer we stick to Isaiah's injunctions the better:—"Turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; . . . honour Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord" (Isaiah lviii. 13, 14).

Now let us inquire what, on the principles already laid down, can profitably be urged in regard to the employment of Sunday for purposes of sight-seeing in connection with museums and picture galleries, and—ultimately, yes, ultimately—theatres. Depend upon it you cannot draw, or, if you attempt to draw you will not long be able to keep up, the distinction between Henry VIII. in model, say, at the South Kensington Museum; and Henry VIII. as represented by Holbein, or somebody at the National Gallery; and Henry VIII. as represented by Irving at the Lyceum Theatre. The ball once set rolling is bound to go on, and those well-meaning (so-called) friends of the working-man who profess to draw their limiting line at the outside of the theatre door, are strangely blind to the fact that they are standing as on a glacier, which is not only slippery, but is perpetually sliding downwards. The continent of Europe and many of the great cities of America tell us a tale, and furnish us with a warning herein, which we must not, indeed cannot, ignore.

The "Sunday Society" says it does not wish for the Continental Sunday, and it proposes, I believe, to go no further than museums, pictures, books, and music. This limitation is upheld, I doubt not in perfect good faith, by many of the clerical and titled supporters of the Society, but it is a matter of notoriety that many supporters (and they some of the most active and aggressive) go far beyond this, and decline to be tied down to any line. Accordingly, whilst one section only

urges the opening of concert halls, such as the Albert Hall and the People's Palace; another section, much more consistent as it seems to me, boldly advocates the opening of theatres; and a third section claims that anything and everything which is not illegal on weekdays shall be rendered not illegal on Sundays. The questions, of course, inevitably suggest themselves: "Why stop at the museum?" "Why stop at the concert hall?" "Why stop at the theatre?" "Why not go on to the circus, then the workshop, and the factory?"

These differences are no differences of principle; only of degree and detail. If the musician is to ply his trade and earn his living playing secular music in the Albert Hall or Battersea Park on Sunday afternoon, why is the mustard manufacturer or the cotton spinner to be debarred by law from running his machinery and earning his living on Sundays if he wishes to do so? It is sometimes suggested: "On this principle the clergy must not be paid for their Sunday work; sidesmen must not collect offertories, nor add up their accounts." This is a very poor joke, not good enough for our old friend, *Punch*.

The question of drawing a line was never more clearly put than by *The Times*, on June 9, 1877, discussing the very subject which we are discussing to-day, the Sunday opening of museums. Said the "leading journal" on the occasion in question:—"We should make a complete breach in the defences which now protect the Sunday as a day of rest, and should have definitely abandoned our general rule. Once throw open, by resolution of the House of Commons, all national museums and picture galleries on Sundays, and it is hard to see what institutions, public or private, we could insist on closing."

The danger of making concessions where a vital principle is at stake, because of the impossibility of securing the permanency of your concessions, is well illustrated by the history of the Sunday Band question. When this nuisance was first pushed to the front, thirty or forty years ago, by organized effort, the plea was urged, "We only ask for the performance of sacred music;" and this plea, industriously asserted and re-asserted, often disarmed opposition and converted opponents into sympathizers. But the mask has long been thrown off. Sacred compositions now either only come into a programme as decoy ducks, or to throw dust in the eyes of the public; or, more often, are contemptuously ignored by being wholly omitted. Hence the following unblushing newspaper advertisement, which appeared in various London daily papers as recently as August 17th, 1895:—

ROYAL ALBERT HALL, Sunday, 18th August, at 3.30. ROYAL ARTILLERY STRING BAND, 60 performers (by permission) (Last Performance but one of present series), Conductor, Cavaliere L. Zavertal, R.A., will PLAY:—
March .. .. .. "L'Africaine" .. .. Meyerbeer.
From the "Gipsy suite" .. .. Ed. German.
(a) Valse Melancolique (Lonely Life)
(b) Tarantelle (the Revel)
"Murmurs of the Sile" .. .. L. Zavertal.
Selection .. .. "Tannhäuser" .. .. .. Wagner.
Organist—Mr. H. C. Tonking.
Vocalists—Miss Florence Hoskins and Mr. Herbert Emlyn.
Accompanist—Mr. Howard Hadley.
Seats 3d., 6d., 1s., and 2s. Admission Free.

Before I pass from the subject of theatres in its bearing on our present discussion, a few more words are requisite in view of certain facts which are notorious. By way of disarming hostile criticism, Sir H. Irving publicly disclaimed, some years ago, any desire to see theatres open on Sundays. . . . . His words in the after-dinner speech at the Arts Club at Manchester in 1888 were:—"English actors would be the very first to resent and oppose any such proposition."—*Bolton Evening News*, Oct. 27, 1888.

. . . . . .

It is idle to say that there is no danger of the theatrical profession being led to lend itself to public theatrical performances on Sunday, if the ice is broken by the National or other Public Museums and Art Galleries being opened on Sundays as a matter of ordinary course. With every desire to find any good I can, anywhere, at any time, I do know—indeed, the fact is notorious—that the theatrical profession at large holds very loose views on the religious obligations of the Lord's Day. Otherwise, how comes it that complaints are constantly cropping up of special Sunday trains for the conveyance of theatrical companies and their bulky impedimenta of scenery and dresses. The *Westminster Gazette*, of Oct. 2, 1893, stated that on the previous Sunday the L. & N. W. Railway "carried no fewer than sixty theatrical companies, numbering altogether 1,339 passengers, whose belongings were carried in seventy-four trucks. The record of the previous Sunday was a big one, but yesterday's well nigh doubled it. The G. N. Railway Company also carried a dozen theatrical companies yesterday." We are further informed (citing *The Referee*, of Sept. 24 and Oct. 1, 1893), "That the two railway companies just mentioned, conveyed in all ninety-three theatrical companies, embracing 2,079 passengers, who, in at least eight cases were conveyed in trains provided by special arrangement; while their luggage, scenery and other paraphernalia filled one hundred and twenty trucks." Surely statistics such as these applying only to two Sundays in one particular year do not agree with Sir H. Irving's plea that "English actors would be the very first to resent and oppose" Sunday theatrical work.

. . . . . .

If the matter were not a serious one, it would be not a little amusing —the specious plea that the opening of public institutions connected with literature, science, or art, is to be deemed expedient in the interest of the "working-man." Unfortunately this much talked about and much patronized personage manifests little or no gratitude to his professed friends for what they are doing on his (supposed) behalf.

In the first place, he does not go when he has the chance; as witness Birkenhead, Chester, Coventry, Fleetwood, Hindley, Lancaster, Leek, Maidstone, Oxford, Stoke-upon-Trent, Tonbridge, Worcester, and Workington, in all of which places Sunday opening has been followed by Sunday closing — institutions opened experimentally having been closed because of the ridiculously inadequate attendances. But this is not all. Buildings still kept open are, to a very slight extent, frequented by the working-man; for instance, at Birmingham, where the greatest measure of success has been achieved, the attendance at the Art Gallery is steadily falling off year by year, *e.g.*: 2,365, 2,310, 1,709, 1,432, 1,188, as between 1888 and 1894. Yet what more special centre of

working-men than Birmingham? And Bradford, Darlington, Halifax, Ipswich, Leicester, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Northampton, combine to tell the same tale. In a few places the attendance, absolutely very small, seems stationary; whilst of no one place in all England can it be said that the statistics show a steady upward progress of attendances. I am here speaking of museums and art galleries only. As regards libraries, the facts are to a very slight extent different. For instance, the average attendance at the Oldham Library has grown from 200 in 1891 to 290 in 1894; but what is this for a population of 131,000. At Gateshead (population 85,000), the library attendance has grown from 204 in 1892, to 221 in 1893, and to 243 in 1894. Are not these figures too ridiculous to dwell upon in connection with the question, "Do the working classes wish these public institutions to be opened on Sunday?"

The lessons taught by the experiments which have already been tried in the way of Sunday opening, will be found, if studied patiently and in detail, to be of a very remarkable and conclusive character. The details, a few of which I have cited, are given very fully in the Rev. Dr. Peake's pamphlet, "Has Sunday Opening of Museums, Art Galleries, and Libraries been a Success?" And I ask all who are minded to support the Sunday opening movement to get up the facts before pledging themselves to an opinion or a vote; otherwise it will soon unpleasantly appear that their efforts for the "good" of the working-man have been wasted; and that they have only provided lounges and playrooms for idle and noisy children, boys and girls. Numerous and convincing are the testimonies as to this fact from all parts of England. So much for what the working-man does when he has the chance. Now let us see what he says when called upon to express an opinion by a vote. On three occasions out of four when the Sunday opening of museums has been discussed at the annual Congress of the trades unions, Sunday opening has been condemned. On the only occasion when there was a vote the other way (Swansea, 1886), the discussion was held on the last day when many members had gone away, and the meeting had dwindled to small proportions. The numbers were 45 for opening and 24 against; only 69 voting. At Southport in the previous year, 1885, the Congress had affirmed in set terms (a much larger number, namely 118 voting), that "it is undesirable to augment Sunday labour by opening the National Museums and Galleries." This is plain enough as a declaration of opinion. The numbers were 51 for opening and 67 against.

. . . . . .

I feel, therefore, that we are entitled to affirm that the artisan classes who have considered the subject have shown, with all sufficient plainness, that they are alive to the fact that once establish generally the custom of opening in England places of instruction and entertainment in the hands of the State or public bodies, and you have obviously paved the way for all kinds of places of amusement—theatres, of course, included—being opened, and that such a change would necessarily carry with it in the near future the making of Sunday to be an ordinary day of work and labour like the other six days of the week. Probably, however, the general body of artisans, though not wishing to work themselves, do not yet sufficiently realize the slavery endured by those in their own line of

life, who are employed on railways, omnibuses, and in connection with conveyances generally. It is here that organizations such as the Lord's Day Observance Society, the Working Men's Lord's Day Rest Association, and the Anti-Sunday Travelling Union, come in so usefully to form and develop public opinion.

There is one point in connection with this Sunday museums etc., controversy which I feel bound to mention and to dwell upon a little. The promoters of the Sunday opening movement largely comprise idle West-enders, who do nothing for themselves, or others, on weekdays or Sundays, but worship the god of pleasure—a sort of nineteenth century Janus, on whose various foreheads are inscribed such names as "golf," "tennis," "boating," "riding," "driving," "lounging," "smoking." Leagued with, and behind these, however, there are certain wire-pullers, who may be ranged in two classes — worshippers of mammon and worshippers of nothing. The former include certain sorts of capitalists, certain proprietors of breweries, many railway directors and traffic managers, and others who make dividends or money the idols to which they bow down. But behind these again there are some much more dangerous classes – the infidels and atheists of all types. These are the most earnest and potent mainsprings of every Anti-Sunday agitation, because, like Voltaire, they comprehend the fact that the infidels have no chance for their pernicious doctrines so long as the Christians stick to their Sunday—an idea focussed by Montelambert in the striking sentence: "*Il n'y a pas de religion sans culte; et il n'y a pas de culte sans Dimanche.*"

. . . . . .

It will be observed that I have treated this question of the Sunday opening of museums, etc., thus far, solely from the standpoint of a principle, with a few occasional illustrations drawn from practice, and have made but little attempt to fortify my views by appeals to names of authority, but there is no lack of these if you would have them. Passing over Prime Ministers, such as Lord Beaconsfield and Mr. Gladstone, both of whom denounced in the most emphatic terms schemes brought up in their day for the Sunday opening of the national museums, I come to a statesman of recent date, whose means of forming a correct judgment on the social and economic questions involved in this controversy were absolutely unique—I mean Mr. W. H. Smith, the great newspaper agent, whose knowledge of the working classes obtained in that capacity was only equalled by his knowledge of what was required for the successful leadership of the House of Commons. With a keen and just insight into the ulterior consequences involved in this movement, he said, when it was under discussion in the House of Commons on June 8, 1877 :—"Taking the proposition as it stood, it involved very much more than stood on the paper of the House. He himself attached enormous value to the Day of Rest, which had been preserved for many centuries. Whether working-men desired to go to church or not on Sunday was not the question. The question was, whether they should have the Day of Rest preserved to them, which the practice of this country had established." And this, indeed, is the point at issue, and I earnestly hope that not alone the working classes, but all classes, will realize the great risk of the loss before they have lost it—whether by legislation or otherwise

of the priceless heritage of a day so truly and so eloquently spoken of by Bishop Christopher Wordsworth as—

"A day of rest and gladness,
A day of joy and light,
A balm of care and sadness,
Most beautiful, most bright."

The Rev. H. H. PEREIRA, Vicar of Croydon.

[*Read by Canon De Chair.*]

AMONGST the many advantages which have resulted from these Church Congresses, we must place in the front rank that of large numbers of men of various opinions and mode of thought coming together for the discussion of burning and very difficult questions in a spirit of earnestness and reverence. Nothing but good has come of this. It has enabled men, in their individual dealings with these questions, to look fairly at both sides and to act with reference to them accordingly.

The subject which I am privileged to bring forward has been the battle-ground on which many a fierce contest has been fought; angry feelings have often been excited by it, and harsh and uncharitable things said; but the matter has not been settled or set at rest, and is pressing still for quiet and impartial consideration with greater persistency than ever, and we may be confident, from the experience of past Congresses, that it will receive just such consideration at our hands, and that nothing but general advantage and benefit will flow therefrom.

Let us try and put the case fairly before ourselves. There are large masses of people in our great towns to whom Sunday is but as the other six days of their week of toil and of labour; to whom it brings no cessation to the weary round of monotonous and ill-paid work; for whom it has no rest or refreshment of body, mind, or spirit: people from whom society exacts, in many cases, more than eighty-four hours of work per week, and gives them in exchange just enough by which to live, but who dare not relax their toil by one hour, even on the Sabbath, except at the peril of losing that poor livelihood which they now obtain. For these the church bell brings no message and utters no inviting call; to them it must sound as worse than a hollow mockery, and seem as if the very church-goers were leagued in a great conspiracy to keep their bodies in slavery and estrange their souls from God.

Other masses of people there are, larger still in number, to whom the Sunday brings indeed, some kind of bodily relief and rest from labour, but for whom the day is unbrightened by one ray of spiritual refreshment or of intellectual and rational elevation, who seek to pass the idle hours of the day in pastimes and amusements, and who can find these only in the public-house, which is always accessible and always near at hand.

Now, however much our opinions may vary as to the manner in which Sunday should be spent, we none of us can think that it should be spent in either of these two ways, and the question before us is how can we improve so deplorable a state of things?

With reference to the first class of persons I have spoken of, the initial step at least is clear. So far from doing anything which shall increase the labours of those overburdened toilers who work their

seven full days a week, there must be a crusade against it. Men, aye, and women and children, too, must be given their opportunities of recreation. There must be a cessation of Home Slavery in the land which justly prides itself on having initiated the movement for the emancipation of the negro slave.

We must hear no more of men working from month's end to month's end, with only a part of one day off—a burden of labour which we know better than to put upon any horse to do. We must agitate so that it may no longer be possible to meet with such a case as the following, which I myself am personally acquainted with at this moment: A man who has been employed by a company on every day throughout the year for many years, without one single holiday, and when stricken down with illness last winter, had his pay stopped from the very hour when his work was discontinued!

We are not here to discuss the eight hours question; but in connection with the observance of Sunday, we rejoice to know that the tendency of the age is to restrict the hours of labour rather than to increase them, and we believe that the working-men of England view with jealous eyes every tendency to encroach, whether on Sunday or on weekdays, upon their well-earned hours of rest. But we sincerely hope that, whether by railway and steamboat companies, or omnibus and cab proprietors; whether in printing offices or bakeries; in public-houses or in the families where the one little household drudge is kept, there will grow up such an appreciation of the spirit of the times, that no employer of labour will dare to impose so unfair and unjust a burden upon the employé as has been, and is still, far too much the case.

But when we have attained—as I think we may fairly hope to do—to this satisfactory state of things, the question follows, "What will our people do with their hours of leisure upon the Sunday?" Will the first class I have spoken of—the ceaseless toilers—be simply merged into the second, of thoughtless revellers and idlers, who let Sunday pass them by, unblessed and unimproved?

The President of the Sunday Society for 1894 used these words in his opening address: "We hold that the Day of Rest, in its best and most Christian sense, should minister as an anodyne to the troubles and cares of a work-a-day life."

I am sure we all of us endorse those words. We hardly can expect to agree upon the best method of securing such an ideal Sunday, but we shall, I hope, be able to credit one another with sincere convictions and honest desires to promote God's glory and the increased welfare of our brother men, in our efforts after reform in the observance of our great Holy Day.

In dealing with those persons who have the leisure to attend Church services, but have absolutely no taste, inclination, or desire for them, are we to say that we will maintain the absolute rigidity of church-going as a necessity, and take care that they shall have nothing else to do (except indeed have easy access to the public-house) if we can help it? Or are we to meet their case and give them an opportunity of recreation of a more elevating character—run the risk which is involved in sanctioning the very small amount of Sunday labour which is required in the opening of museums, art galleries, and institutions of a kindred character, and of perchance of attracting some away from their church? There

are difficulties involved in answering either of these questions, and yet they must be answered.

In our great cities there are vast numbers of the humbler classes to whom Sunday furnishes the only, or nearly the only, opportunity for those innocent, and at the same time elevating, recreations and studies which those of the richer classes enjoy, or may enjoy, not only on the Sunday, but on every day in the week. The breathing of the fresh air, the sight of flowers in our fields, the gazing on noble works of art, the insight into God's creation as revealed by science or by nature, are the very gifts which, if they can be bestowed on our humbler brethren without interference with the sacred and solemn character of the day, and without entrenching on the hours of repose so dear to every working-man, we should most desire to place within their reach.

On the other hand, the change of day from the seventh to the first in the week in no way detracts from the validity of the Fourth Commandment, which is as binding on the Christian as any other of the Commandments of the Law. God created a Sabbath for ever and for ever to be a record of His creation and His rest. It was a Divine Commandment in the time of Adam, and so far from its being weakened by the mere change of day, its sacredness has been immensely added to by the mighty events —the resurrection of our Lord, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit— which it commemorates. If it was needed by man in those early days of the world's existence, when there was no sin, no sorrow, no harrowing toil, and no carking care to burden and weary the mind and body—when every day was, in a sense, a Sabbath—how much more is it needed now by a world steeped to the lips in business, and drawn incessantly away from God by the enticements of an evil heart.

Through His whole earthly life and ministry our Master honoured the Sabbath Day, and enforced its sanctification. It was He Who told us so emphatically that it was for man's good, and help, and strengthening, that God in His mercy made this provision for him. But whilst fully remembering this, and blessing God's holy name for this, and praying and working to make our Sundays more and more days of spiritual refreshment, of mental solace and of bodily rest—and striving to put the highest possible idea of it before our people—we cannot yet forget that there are times when the breach of the letter of the command is the truest fulfilment of the spirit of its obligation. In the midst of His observance of the Sabbath by His attendance at the synagogue, we note the many miracles of healing and of mercy which our Lord wrought upon the Sabbath Day. We remember how He swept away the frivolous traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, and we ask ourselves, whilst most deeply thankful for our God-given day of rest, whilst most keenly jealous to defend its sacredness from desecration, or its hallowed rest from profanation—whether we may not be endeavouring to bind a heavy weight upon the shoulders of our Master's weakest children, when we say that there shall be for them, in their hard and burdened lives, nothing but those Church services, which, alas! many of them have never learned to value, and which even to those who are most regular in their attendance, could not fill up the leisure of the day. Many years ago, when quite a young man, I spent some months in London by myself; I remember, with a vividness which will never pass from me, how dreary and how heavy were the hours of the Sunday afternoons. A

wet Sunday was a calamity indeed. Should I have been guilty of a sin—should I have violated the Fourth Commandment had I spent, if I had been able to, some of those hours in the National Gallery or the British Museum? I cannot think so.

I shall perhaps be thought to be inconsistent in deprecating Sunday labour, whilst advocating the opening of museums and art galleries; but I would point out that there is but a very trifling amount of labour required for a very large number of persons to be benefited. In every church we unhesitatingly call to work on every Sunday more people than a large picture gallery or museum would require. Besides which, were this seriously the only objection, provision could easily be made by which volunteer helpers might undertake a great part of these duties.

Up to the present time about eighty-five national and municipal institutions are open to the public upon this day, and the testimony of those well qualified to judge is altogether favourable as to the result. The report of a committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1893 closes with the words, "Your committee desires the adoption of every possible safeguard against unfairness and misuse in the case of libraries, museums, and art galleries now open on Sunday under the sanction of the law as it stands. Subject to these conditions your committee is of opinion that the cause of the religion of Christ has nothing to fear from the reasonable and careful extension of the principle of Sunday opening."

Sunday concerts I cannot view with favour. It is one thing to have these quiet resting places open in which, if their taste allows it, people can admire the pictures, and even where lads may meet their lasses, and so spend an hour in respectable and happy courtship: it is quite another to have these entertainments, even when gilded with the bait of sacred music, with the accompanying crowd, noise and excitement, which would be out of harmony with the sacred peace and quiet which should characterize the day.

Sunday bands—amongst which I must include those of the Salvation Army, the most noisy and least musical of all—I think have done much harm. They unsettle our young people, they attract children from their Sunday schools, and, when played in the evening, they draw away from church. I would far rather allow organ grinders to play in the slums than bands to play in the parks of our large towns. The slums need more to brighten them.

I am sure I speak for all here when I say that our full sympathies are with the sons of toil. Pent up all day at their work, often in a stifling atmosphere, in close and ill-ventilated rooms; often engaged in unhealthy trades, anything which can be done to enable them to breathe the fresh air of heaven and enjoy the sights and sounds of nature, should be done, so long as thereby injury and injustice are not inflicted upon others. I greatly fear that Sunday travelling does do this most seriously. It is not only that an army of about 150,000 men are thus necessarily employed upon our railways alone on Sunday, and so deprived, not only of any chance of attending a place of worship, but also from having needful rest or enjoying any opportunity of spending some quiet hours in their homes, but we must remember that an infinitely larger number of Sunday workers are thus called to labour by ministering to the requirements of the travellers at hotels, public-houses, etc. One cannot

help suspecting that a large number of Sunday excursions and other trains owe their origin not in the desire to *meet* a popular want so much as to *create* one. No doubt an extra half per cent. dividend has a fascination for directors and no inconsiderable attraction for the average shareholder; but we may legitimately protest against its being earned at so heavy a cost as that of practically depriving thousands of our fellows of rest or recreation for body, mind, or soul. Besides which, the places visited by excursion trains and steamboats suffer grievously by this influx of holiday people. I could mention several small seaside places which are quite demoralized during the height of the summer season by this invasion of a noisy and excited crowd.

If every large town had its spacious museums, art galleries, and winter gardens, and these were open and accessible to the people, no appreciable labour would be involved, and an enormous crowd of well-disposed persons could spend their Sunday afternoons in a manner quite consistent with the most correct observance of the fourth commandment. A great deal of the change of air and scene which seems to be such a growing need to all in these days, surely could be met and adequately provided for by the universal observance of a weekly and week-day half-holiday, and that a real and not a sham one. Not a half-holiday which, as is often the case now, commences practically at five o'clock in winter, but one which commences at not later than one o'clock p.m. throughout the year.

To my mind there is absolutely no excuse for the selfishness and godlessness of those well-to-do persons who, having the whole week more or less to themselves, do not hesitate to make Sunday a day of pleasure and amusement, and employ a large number of persons to minister to their wants and luxuries. We hear amongst the leisured classes of tennis parties and picnics, of dances and dinner parties, and even recently of shooting parties on Sunday. For myself I cannot too strongly express my indignation at the selfishness and lack of thought for the interests of others which such persons manifest. These are for the most part the mere parasites of society; by the accident of their inherited wealth they do nothing to contribute to the thought or wealth or well-being of the commonwealth, and they cannot even refrain from their unceasing round of pleasure-seeking even upon the one day in seven in which their hard-working and most patient servants may have a little rest, and a little chance, of living as beings with souls, and not as mere drudging animals. The facilities rendered by masters and mistresses to their servants rightly to observe Sunday, forms one of the best tests as to whether they themselves feel an interest in them or not. In conclusion, let me say that we must not over-rate the good effect of enabling the masses of our large towns to have access to museums and so forth on Sunday afternoons. These places will simply furnish opportunities to the well-disposed for quiet intellectual amusement. The majority of those who habitually neglect all the means of grace will be unaffected, for a time at least, thereby, but it will be, at least, a step in the right direction.

It may be thought that in this paper I have given forth rather an uncertain sound; that I have not denounced, without qualification, all Sunday recreation for the toiling masses, and have even expressed a certain measure of sympathy with it in its quieter and most restful forms:

and on the other hand that, so far from conceding the principle of a Sabbath rest being observed upon our Sunday, I have earnestly striven to support it. I have had before me very clearly in studying this question, on the one hand the monotonous and unlovely lives to which many millions of our brothers and sisters are at present doomed, and I shrink, not only from adding to their grievous burden, but from refusing my help to relieve them of some little portion of its weight; and, on the other hand, I have had equally clearly before me the blessing, the inestimable blessing, of a well spent day in every seven, with its boon of grace to the needy soul and its refreshing rest to the toiling body, and I hope, as I believe, that these two objects are reconcilable with each other, and that striving after this in our Master's spirit, we may humbly hope for His blessing on the issue.

May I say in conclusion that there are many persons, I believe, who are not disinclined to allow such a measure of relief as I have suggested, were it not that they dread its being the introduction of the thin end of the wedge, which will result in the development of an absolutely continental Sunday. Do not let us be afraid of that bug-bear, "the thin end of the wedge." If the thing in itself is not wrong we need not fear that its consequences will be injurious. Let the Church rather be bold and fear less in advocating all measures of relief and help for her over-burdened and heavily-weighted children. She need not fear that they will abuse her care for and interest in them. They will learn from all such efforts that she not only means to be, but *is* their friend: that she shrinks from the consideration of no questions simply because they are difficult, that she even will not hesitate to put aside long-formed prejudices and modes of action of her own, when she finds that it is for her children's good and her Master's glory that such changes should be made. And when her people are convinced that she is truly their friend, they will surely listen to her voice when she bids them refrain from pleasures and pursuits which she believes will be for their hurt and injury, because they are breaches of God's commands or the Church's law. To be at the same time cautious and bold in reform is difficult, but by no means beyond attainment. There have been great popular movements in which the Church seems to have been reluctantly dragged along, instead of being found in her right position at their head, guiding and controlling them. I trust, as I believe, that in the settlement of this Sunday question, she will be found in her proper place as the friend of the people and their guide to God.

The Right Rev. The PRESIDENT.

I REGRET to say, dear friends, that I must now leave the chair, as I am due elsewhere, but I hope you will all remain. I should like to say it seems to me that up to the present the question has almost exclusively turned upon whether it is justifiable to engage in certain pursuits on the Lord's Day. Visiting museums on the Lord's Day is a very innocent thing to do, but we must also consider whether our amusement, which is very innocent on weekdays, is also innocent on the Lord's Day, because the Lord's Day is dedicated to the worship of God. We must consider whether it is right for us to do some similar matters, or engage in some recreation, if thereby we rob God of that time for worship which is His

due: "Whosoever offereth Him thanks and praise, He honoureth." I think that is particularly applicable to the affluent classes, who I think are the greatest sinners in this respect. It is quite common in fashionable society to spend the Sunday in such amusements as lawn tennis and golf, and for young ladies to lounge about all day reading a novel. An excuse is made, and it is justified by the great majority, that the Christians on the continent are as much Christian as we are, and they do not observe Sunday in a Puritanical fashion. We who stick to the English ideas of Sunday reply: "I do not think we are so hard up to-day that we need desire to imitate the fashions of the continent, and to secularize a portion of the Lord's Day." You must not forget that Roman Catholics have so many more days of obligation when they are bound to worship God in their own churches. During the weekdays there are generally two or three festivals, and all those who call themselves religious people will be found in their churches, and therefore they give a considerable time to the worship of God in their churches. But our fashionable people I am sorry to say do not do that. They only worship God on a Sunday, so that they would be robbing God in two ways. One other point I will make. Mr. Pereira said that a committee of Convocation reported with some qualification in favour of the opening of museums on the Lord's Day. Mr. Pereira forgot to add that that report was rejected by the bishops by at least six to one. I was one of the majority, I need not say. For my own part, I can only say that I was brought up by my dear parents to abstain from doing anything secular on the Sabbath. They were not Puritans, but they were old fashioned Church-people, They brought me up to abstain from doing anything on the Lord's Day, except it had a religious tendency. I was never allowed to play any games, and they discouraged me from reading any works of fiction, or anything except of a religious character. I, however, never thought Sunday a tedious day in my life. Of all the blessings I received from my father and mother there is no blessing for which I honour them more devoutly than that of reverencing the Lord's Day.

ADDRESS.

(1) Sunday Opening.

G. Dack, Esq.

If I understand rightly the desire of those who are so anxious to open museums and provide recreations for the people, it is for the benefit of that class to which I myself belong, the working class; and the question that arose in my mind was, "Does the working-man want it?" Do they ask for it? I have yet to learn that they have asked for it, and I have yet to come across the working-man who has said, "I want my Sundays so that I can amuse myself." What the working-man says is, "I want my Sundays so that I can have a day of rest." I am speaking now for thousands of working-men who I rub shoulders with every week. Then the question is asked, "If the working-men do not want it, how is it you find them participating in all those facilities provided, such as going to Sunday museums and Sunday excursions, etc.?" That is one of the inconsistencies of the age that we have to deal with. I have never known a working-man say I want to work on the Sabbath, but I have

found working-men who ask for Sunday labour because there is a shilling or two to be earned. That is another inconsistency that we have to deal with.

With regard to the evil of the Sunday opening of museums. The first evil which occurs to me is that it draws a man from his home. It draws a man from the society of his wife and family, who claim his presence on the Sabbath day. A wife with four or five children has a pretty hard time during the week in looking after them, while the children perhaps have scarcely seen their father, and it does seem very unfair that he should be enticed away on the Sabbath day, the only day that he can see his children. I do not suppose there are many ladies here who understand what a working-man's home is, in which the wife is tied up with four or five little children all the week. If that woman does not need the presence of her husband to brighten that home on one day of the week, I do not know a creature who does. When a man is enticed from his home, he does not leave it without spending money which he can ill afford, and I have known working-men, who have spent their Sundays in enjoying themselves, who have been in a far worse state on Monday morning than on Saturday night—worse in pocket, worse in physique, and worse altogether. To spend Sundays in this manner means to sap at the home-life of working-men. It means that it is an injustice to the man on the one hand, as it entices him away from home, and an injustice to his wife and children. Those are the injustices which are inflicted on working-men by those who desire to benefit them. I am not attacking individuals of any class, but I am attacking principles which I believe to be wrong.

Then look at the work Sunday amusements entail upon the working classes. The working classes have to bear the burden of all the work that the pleasure-seeking classes entails, and that surely is an injustice to them. Home-life is the very foundation of the social system, and the opening of museums would injure this home-life. If a man were to keep at home he might possibly take two or three of his little children for a walk for an hour or two, and thereby relieve his wife, or he might take one or two of the children to God's house, or he might mind the house and children, and let his wife go to church. Some may think that this is grandmotherly talk, but it is a living fact that if you take a man away from his home on the Sabbath day, that his love for home and those who have a right to that love will lessen.

Then there is the spiritual disadvantage to those who are compelled to work on the Sabbath. It is said that those who work on Sunday can have the Monday off, but that is an injustice to those working on the Sabbath, because our churches and chapels are not open on Monday. Therefore, those men are deprived of that spiritual food which they might have had by sitting in God's house on the Sunday. I have never come across a working-man who has not considered that, if he were compelled to work on the seventh day, it would be an inroad upon his privileges. I feel myself that it is both against the law of God and men to compel any one man to work seven days in the week. Every individual has a right to call one day in the week his own, and no class of men suffer more than the working classes through this Sabbath-breaking. I do not expect, whatever decision this Congress may come to that it will stop the Sunday opening of museums, or Sunday pleasure; but what I want is to see this Congress and the Church set its face like flint against every inroad upon the sacredness of the Sabbath. One of the grandest things that God has done for man is to give him one day that he might set apart to serve Him in sincerity and in truth.

Then I am told that there are thousands of persons who would not go to churches and chapels if you did not open museums on the Sunday. That does not matter to you and

me. If you provide means that compel a man to work, I consider those who provide those means are equally guilty, and more guilty, than the men who are compelled to work. What we have to do is to see that a man has the privilege of spending the Sabbath in God's house, and it rests with that man alone how he spends the Sunday. I am firmly convinced of this principle, that working-men, or any other class of men, should not be surrounded by stumbling-blocks and temptations, but that they should be moved out of the road, so that it should be made hard for a man to do wrong. I believe in my own heart the Saviour would say, "Oh, save man from those temptations, remove the stumbling-blocks from My people, and let them come to Me." The opening of museums on Sunday, and indulging in amusements on the Sunday, are stumbling-blocks, and they are supported by some people who, I am sorry to say, profess to love God.

Not long ago I saw in a certain paper that the writers were gloating over the success that had been achieved through the opening of museums on Sunday, and the pleasure that they had obtained for the people, or the means of pleasure, and I was very sorry to see the name of a great Prelate at its head. On reading this, my heart went up to God, and I prayed to God to alter this. It is an injustice; it is something that will tend to blind men to the faith. And, mark you, if the Church panders to this sort of thing, it will have a very bad effect. If the Church is to be what it professes to be, it must stand up for what is right. God grant that this Congress may come to a decision to set their faces like flint, and not encourage any inroads upon the sacredness of the Sabbath, which was given to man for a blessing.

DISCUSSION.

H. W. HILL, Esq.

IT must be sorrowfully admitted that the decay of the Puritan spirit has led to a great amount of unlawful license in this matter of "Sabbath" observance, rather than to the enjoyment of a reasonable and proper Christian liberty. In regard to one class of the people referred to already several times this afternoon—I mean the idle rich—I think myself that it should be the duty of the clergy to denounce their selfishness at every opportunity. People who have nothing in particular to do but to consume that which they have not produced, and have six days in which to find plenty of enjoyment, I regard as being wickedly selfish in wanting to use the Lord's Day for further pleasure and creating an amount of unnecessary labour to minister to their desires. Another class has not been referred to particularly, I mean the artisan class in our towns, especially in London. They are not as a class church-going. Until lately they have, on Sundays, interested themselves very much indeed with political and social questions; and I think you will agree with me, that if you were to look down the list of club notices in the Sunday newspapers, you will find that in place of some attention being paid to questions affecting their moral and political well-being, you will find that to-day those considerations have given place to nothing more nor less than Sunday amusements of a very doubtful character—entertainments of a mere "penny gaff" order, and a general license that bodes no good for the class in question. Now in dealing with these two classes, I think we want to teach them what is the true ideal as to Sunday observance. Mr. Murray, who read the first paper, very truly said that the whole spirit should be that of worship. I think we should ask the clergy to strenuously teach that the primitive ideal of the weekly assembling together for the breaking of bread is the Christian ideal to be reached, and that morning and evening prayer are not of general obligation. In dealing with what are called by some of our Puritan friends "sabbath breakers," we must distinguish between those who are really idle people and that great class, mostly made up of the middle class, who work very hard indeed, and to whom Sunday is the only possible day for seeking any reasonable recreation; and to remember that in virtue of the Incarnation it surely is true that all things genuinely human are also divine; and

further, that inasmuch as the body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, it is surely a Christian work that that body should have a reasonable recreation. I do not think myself that the difficulties in regard to the opening of museums and picture galleries are so great as some of our good friends are inclined to think; nor do I imagine for a moment that such a course would lead to any increased amount of unnecessary Sunday labour. There is quite enough Sunday labour, particularly in London; that I admit; but my experience of the working-men, who are really keen on this particular question, justifies me in expressing the opinion that they are not irreligious men. If we would only teach them what is the real Christian ideal of worship, I do not see myself why they should not be led to participate in Christian worship every Lord's Day, and at the same time promote the health and provide recreation for their fellows by such measures as they advocate. We must remember also, in regard to the wage-earners in London, that the observance of what is called the old-fashioned Sunday is scarcely a possibility, and for this reason: the homes of these people are too confined, there is no room really for the whole family at home at one time on the Sunday, and to remain there in what is called the old-fashioned way, joining in Sunday reading and that kind of thing, is out of the question. That is why the club movement in the poorer parts of London has grown so enormously. Remember, also, with regard to these people, that Sunday is the one day in the week for the family dinner, which certainly does not tend to promote an intelligent use of the Lord's Day, as it leads to a great amount of over-eating.

The Rev. H. H. HENSON, Vicar of S. Margaret's, Barking, Essex; and Fellow of All Souls', Oxford.

I HAVE a very few words to say, but at the same time it might be useful just to say those few words. We are all agreed that there is a great tendency operating in our midst towards the renunciation of the old Puritanical strict observance of the Sabbath, and I should like to deprecate any excessive estimate of the English Sunday as we have it now. I think rather conflicting pictures have been drawn by some of the previous speakers as to the English Sunday to which it has been proposed in certain directions to allow a larger liberty of treatment. In my own experience of some years in large English parishes, both in London and in the diocese of S. Albans, I am bound to say that I find that for the masses Sunday is a day of late slumbers, of large domestic gluttony, and consequently long protracted afternoon slumber. That being so, I cannot quite regard with such horror any attempt to disturb this sacred institution as that which has inspired some of the speakers. On the other hand, I do not think it is kept sufficiently in view what an enormous place in the religious tradition of our people the strict observance of Sunday holds; and I contend that we ought to touch this matter lightly, so as not to disturb ancient traditions, and so to inflict a wound on a large number of our people, which it would be very uncharitable to inflict. Therefore, I would suggest that our duty is, without any undue respect for the English Sunday, to be exceedingly slow, careful and chary in the way we interfere with its observance. I would also say this, that I think it is our bounden duty to see if we cannot meet and direct into good and wholesome channels the really great and growing demand for a different, and yet, on the whole, a better observance of the Sunday than obtains amongst multitudes to-day, and I think a beginning may be made. We have had some remarks with which I greatly sympathize with reference to brass bands. Brass bands are abominable to me. I hate them; but on the other hand they are exceedingly attractive to the English people. I would like to suggest a little experiment which I have tried in my own parish, and which has proved very successful. On Sunday afternoons, for some years past, I have engaged a brass band to play in my vicarage garden from three to five. I have generally paid a guinea for the band. The band comes in the garden and plays selections of music. They choose what they call sacred music, but I do not tie them to it, because I consider all good music sacred, and all bad is not. While the band is performing I am on the ground and meet my parishioners, and talk to them, and at four o'clock I generally give them a little address, for which I wear my surplice, and my good workmen made me a pulpit from which I speak to them. That has gone on for four years, and I see no reason why it should not be practised in other places where there is a vicarage garden. I can assure you that if you adopt this plan it will have a very good influence in the parish, and it will interrupt

the Sunday slumbers. I would like to say this in conclusion, that we have to draw the line sharply between disciples and non-disciples, in the matter of observing this holy day. We have no right to go to a man and say that things are wrong which are not wrong, except from the standpoint of a disciple. If we drew that distinction we should get a larger observance of the positive laws of religion. When it comes to the practice of discipleship, I cannot understand for one moment how a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ can treat Sunday in any other way than as binding on his conscience in the highest degree. We have heard a good deal of well-deserved criticism on the upper classes as to the way they spend the Lord's Day, but I never like to attack individuals who are not present; I would prefer to talk about it if I had the subjects in front of me. I do not think any of the gentlemen I am addressing are likely to play golf on Sunday.

The Rev. JOSEPH MCCORMICK, D.D., Vicar of S. Augustine's, Highbury; and Prebendary of York.

I WOULD rather be disposed to dissent from the last point of the previous speaker, because it is a law of God that applies to mankind generally, and, being such, every person is bound to obey, whether he chooses to call himself a disciple or not. There is one thing that cannot but give us a considerable amount of satisfaction, and that is the tone that has been adopted in this discussion with reference to the due observance of the Lord's Day. The paper that was read by the Rev. H. Pereira was very different from the manner in which those who advocated the opening of museums in days gone by treated this topic. It is now allowed that the Fourth Commandment is an obligation. Not only so, but the speaker has gone a step further and has quoted or referred to a well-known passage of Isaiah, and he has based it upon Christian ground as well as upon the law. Mr. Chambers, in touching upon this point, quoted the passage in full, and it seems to me that it goes to the very root of this controversy. There you have what is certainly a spiritual interpretation of the Fourth Commandment. You have what is truly termed evangelistic teaching, because Isaiah was the evangelistical prophet. The sum and substance is this, that the day is to be consecrated to God, so that man is not to think his own thoughts, or pursue his own pleasure, but he is to spend it as a day that is holy unto the Lord; not to give it up to golf or cricket, but to give it up entirely to God. Mind you, this is the holy ground that we ought to take, and if we abandon it we shall do wrong. If we hold by that which God commanded, then we stand on firm ground. I was very much pleased to hear a working-man address the meeting, and I believe that he gave echo to the general sentiments and principles of the working class at large. I have had the pleasure of speaking on this question at more than one Church Congress, and I very well recollect the sort of unpleasant feeling that was created at the Manchester Church Congress when proposals, such as have been placed before you to-day, were brought forward. The people there assembled did not know whether to cheer or hiss. They did not like to hiss, and they did not like to cheer; but when I announced, after following these speakers, that I entirely dissented from their views, there was cheering from one end of that vast meeting to the other. The working-man knows that if you begin to relax the laws concerning the Lord's Day he will be called in to work, and it will not be for him a day of rest or spiritual enjoyment. He is no fool in connection with this question. Then there is a delightful change going on on the Continent of Europe in relation to Sunday. Those of you who have been in the habit of travelling will know that many shops are shut on Sundays now, simply because of the influence of English people. You have also this fact, which is delightful, that there have been discussions on the Continent of Europe amongst the working classes themselves about the strict observance of one day in seven for the benefit of working-men. It is encouraging to find that even in Japan they are following the example of the English people as to having a regular and settled day of rest. As regards the practice of the aristocracy, all I can say is that they little know the opinions that are expressed upon their proceedings by the servants they employ. It is a dangerous thing for men in high position, who have much leisure, to provoke a feeling of anger against them because of their method of spending the Sunday amongst those they employ, and that feeling is growing. When men have plenty of time for recreation throughout the week, it is most unfair and unbecoming, I will say, it is a wicked thing, to prevent their servants from going to God's house, and making the Lord's Day the hardest day in the week

for them. Now it has been said, and it is quite true, that the English stand alone in the strict observance of the Lord's Day. It is sometimes a magnificent thing for a man to stand alone, and it is a noble and blessed thing that England, the most prosperous and the most religious nation in the world, has determined—for I can speak for you and for the people of this country—never to surrender the right that has been a benefit to mind, body, and soul, the right of obeying the Commandment of God, and of reaping that blessing that He intended thereby to bestow.

The Rev. G. N. HERBERT, Vicar of S. John-de-Sepulchre, Norwich.

IT has been said by some of our ablest theologians that one of the great distinctions between the Christian religions and the religion of heathenism is, that whereas they lay down certain minute details for life and conduct, the Christian religion sets forth certain principles which we are bound to apply ourselves in our own individual lives and in the life of the community. I venture to apply that thought to the question of Sunday observance, and though time will not permit me to go into details, I may summarize and say that we find there are these three principles underlying Sunday observance set forth in Holy Writ. First of all that it is a day of rest, second that it is a day of home life, and third that it is a day for the worship of Almighty God. With regard to joining in the various amusements or recreations, or by whatever men please to call them, on Sunday, I think each man's own conscience must be the guide as to the line of action he intends to follow. We cannot lay down hard and fast lines one for another; each one's conscience must be clear in the sight of God. My reason, however, for asking to be allowed to address the Congress is to say, that although I do not hold a brief for the working-man, it has been my lot for many years to work amongst artisans, and I can only endorse what has fallen from the working-man who addressed us, that I never found them advocating the relaxation of our English Sunday. It was my privilege to meet a large number of Trades Unionists last Monday by the special invitation of the Trades Council. They brought strong charges against the Church, and there was a good deal of plain speaking on both sides; but they did not hint at such a thing as secularizing Sunday. It is all very well opening museums—there may be a great deal to be said in favour of that; but it is the thin end of the wedge, and if you once begin to relax the religious observance of Sunday, you do not know where it will stop. It is a remarkable thing that so many working-men oppose most strongly the opening of places of innocent recreation, because they know where it will lead to. One speaker said we owe a great deal to Puritanism. This is true; and though I am myself a loyal and devoted Churchman, I come of those who claim to be of the Puritan stock, and there is a good deal of Puritan blood which still runs in my veins, and I say if it comes to a question of the Puritan Sunday or the Continental Sunday, God help us to maintain the Puritan Sunday.

The Rev. Dr. PEAKE, Secretary of the Lord's Day Observance Society.

MAY I briefly qualify one or two statements in the paper of the Vicar of Croydon, although I desire most emphatically to recognize that in that paper we hail an opponent who uses moderation of language and a general tone of agreement with our principles which is very rare indeed in my experience. He talks of large masses of non-Churchmen who desire museums to be open on Sunday, because they have no other place to go to. I see they play football by thousands on Hampstead Heath on Saturday afternoon, and elsewhere, but I do not think they are found in considerable numbers at the Guild Hall or other museums on the Sunday. Mr. Pereira spoke of the small amount of labour involved in the Sunday opening of museums, but his own Archbishop has recently complained that over and above the actual amount of labour in the building, there is a vast amount of contingent labour, such as the running of trains, omnibuses, and other vehicles, labour in the refreshment rooms, and on the part of others who cater for the public. He, however, proposed that the work should be done by volunteers, but that has not, in some cases, been found a success. He also spoke of eighty-five instances of Sunday

opening, but there are only forty, the rest being mere branches. Mr. Pereira also stated that the results of Sunday opening of museums had been favourable; but if you will take a copy of the pamphlet which I have in my hand, you will find there is no basis for that statement. The Bishop of Norwich has already referred to the action of Convocation in this question. May I be allowed to amplify it? Not only did the bishops reject the proposal to open museums on Sunday, but the Lower House rejected the report. The House of Laymen set the example of rejecting it more unanimously than the other two houses. Finally, may I use the words with which the Archbishop closed the recent declaration on this important subject? "We may take it for granted that we are supporting the cause of the working-man if we do our very utmost to prevent Sunday desecration."

S. ANDREW'S HALL.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 11TH, 1895.

The Very Rev. the Dean of NORWICH in the chair.

OUR CATHEDRALS.

(1) THEIR UTILITY AND MAINTENANCE.

(2) THEIR INFLUENCE THROUGHOUT THE DIOCESE

PAPER.

(1) THEIR UTILITY AND MAINTENANCE.

The Right Rev. H. W. YEATMAN, D.D., Bishop Suffragan of Southwark.

THERE was in the middle ages a passion for the creation of corporate bodies. Guilds, crafts, towns, religious bodies hastened to obtain immunity from divers other authorities which oppressed their purse or action, and cathedrals were no exception. As far as Church organization is concerned, perhaps we are neither sorry nor surprised that it was so; for what other bulwark would have been sufficient to guarantee freedom of thought and action against the encroachments of pope and king? The present freeholds of the clergy, though often very puzzling to any man who is set to guide or rule a diocese, have nevertheless bred much of that sturdiness of English thought which we are proud of, and have fostered a wholesome sense of responsibility, which brings out that manliness of character which we like to think has been a characteristic of the English priesthood.

Yet this independence has sometimes gone too far for membership of one body. To-day Christians are confronting enormous adverse forces: a fight has to be fought which demands unity of aim and method; all other powers in the land which look for victory are marshalled by one steady hand and head; and the Church cannot afford to play too long with check and countercheck, and so produce a feeble resultant. If then, the Church desires spiritual victory for her Master, she must drill her forces; and the first clear principle to be observed by any cathedral which has ambition to fulfil its duty and preserve its utility, is that although the cathedral should be the main *wheel* of the diocese, the main *spring* is the bishop. Once it was said by a bishop, "I have less hand

in shaping the action of my cathedral than I have in some small parish church." Such a condition ought to be out of the question now.

The origin of this cathedral isolation was probably due to the absentee bishops, appointed because they were secular servants of the State, not because they were *Pastores Pastorum;* but a glance back behind these middle-age days of abuse of patronage to the earlier conception of the bishop's church and chapter, as shown by Dr. Freeman, Archbishop Benson, Canon Wordsworth, and others, to whom I owe many of these thoughts, will enable us, I think, to see that the cathedral system is still vigorous enough for the needs of our urgent diocesan life at the end of the nineteenth century.

Dr. Freeman dismisses the idea that the cathedral church (in England at least) was primarily the possession of the cathedral city; it was often placed in some small town, to be there "the hearth and home of the diocese," the bishop and his church belonging rather to the whole tribe or district.

From such a centre issued the missionary efforts of an invading kingdom of Christ, showing its power, first in the proclamation of the word, and then in the application of those precepts in the ennoblement of human nature and in works of pity.

The clergy who surrounded their bishop would plant the cross in some district, and remain to edify the souls of those who heard, until the early minsters (still traceable, scattered over some of our dioceses) were erected, and the parochial life began. Others, meanwhile, would push forward music, letters, the arts of human succour, or whatever could build up mankind, thrusting these blessings out more and more from the diocesan centre, and returning ever and anon for counsel, refreshment, praise, penitence, and prayer.

Such was the picture of the outcome from the cathedral; but what of the inflow? It was a city set on a hill, thither the tribes went up, "every order of genius (says Archbishop Benson) and capability was to find there its shelter, its training, its avenue, its influence."

This was a splendid working plan, but it will be seen that it rested on a strong Episcopacy. The bishop was the backbone—all must have its relation to him as master and adviser; if he were strong, all else would be strong; if he were absent or weak, all would languish.

So much for the cathedral's attitude to the bishop; but then there was the bishop's attitude to his cathedral.

The association of the two was very close—the bishop was not sole, the chapter could not do without him—but then he could not do without the chapter. Records show conclusively that the counsel of the chapter was necessary to the bishop. The archbishop even says, "It is not possible to point to any Episcopal chair which is not at once seen surrounded by its 'senatus.'" Saravia calls the canons *Fratres episcopi*, and Cardinal Pole is quoted in "The Cathedral" as saying "that the rationale and ground of instituting canonries and prebends in churches was that those who are appointed to them may assist the bishop, and aid him with counsel and work in the discharge of his office and in divine things" And to be more modern, Bishop Wordsworth in his visitation of Lincoln Cathedral, 1873, says, "I conceive that the larger chapter of the cathedral church is the legitimate council of the bishop,"

and he quotes Dr. Inett that they were to "serve as council and assistant to their bishop in all the offices of his sacred function."

Now let us look at what I may call the external influence of the cathedral so constituted a little closer. Some men, even now, although they would cry loudly against such a condition of cathedral slumber as seemed at the time to justify the legislation of 1840, yet would desire to see an almost absorbing life of religious devotion as the main usefulness of the cathedral; let it, they seem to say, be not only the model of all other service, but let it be the censer from which for ever may rise the incense stream of prayer for those who elsewhere are struggling in the diocesan battle; above all things, let our canons be men of ceaseless prayer.

And who can for a moment desire that this should not be so? We who are tossed about in the hurry of town work look back with wistful eyes to our great churches, and enquire whether Moses' hands are still uplifted on the Mount for us. Yet we should mistake if we thought that because the cathedral was the centre of diocesan prayer, therefore the canons were not elsewhere often and actively employed.

A glance at the offices they held will be our corrective. In almost all the old foundations are seen "the dignitaries," dignified originally by the highest honour, I mean the dignity of responsibility and labour. First there was the dean, *primus inter pares*, and no doubt mostly engaged with his own church and chapter, yet holding often very considerable ruling power, which had wide influence outside the Close walls; then there was the precentor, concerned with the music and worship of the diocese; after him the chancellor, or minister of education, holding in his hands the Church's influence over the schools; then the treasurer. With regard to such men, the archbishop tells us that "there was not in the mind of the old cathedral lawgivers the slightest idea that the canonical life and cathedral work began and ended with cathedral service: the worship of the diocese was centred here; but with regard to the canons, although attendance at this worship was an essential part of their *life*, it was the smallest part of their *work*."

Now this, I think, is sufficient back-look at the old cathedrals to enable us to see what the outlook is, while we still take our stand on the original intention.

Hardly any legislation which has meddled with and patched the Church has robbed us of opportunities for present efficiency so much as the Cathedrals Acts at the beginning of this reign, which assumed that what had been allowed to sleep could not be revived, and must be destroyed. It was a cruel impatience with the torpor of the Church's most necessary organization! Amid laughter, four hundred and sixty-three canonries, which might now have been filled with hard-working diocesan officers, or students, or philanthropists, or men whose busy work was done, but who still could lift up for us their holy hands in prayer, were swept away by a stroke of the Parliamentary pen.

Yet the reason is not far to seek. The cathedrals in those days had failed to take proper part in the awakening energy of the diocese, and the few far-seeing Churchmen who deprecated the act were lost in the sneers of the majority, who could not believe that cathedrals had any part to play except as museums of ancient art and literature, and places of dignified ease.

But we are not likely to fall into such error again; everywhere the cathedrals are endeavouring to fulfil their original intention as "the heart and home" of the diocese.

In some respects our debt to them has been continuous. Music, for example. They have kept alive what otherwise would have been almost lost. Few can tell what English music owes to the cathedrals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is remarkable that when much else was allowed to drop, the lovely Anglican daily service was steadily performed, to the great encouragement of some of the best music we have. And still in many dioceses the cathedral is the mother of Church music. The diocesan festivals, the stimulus to improvement, style, and reverence given to parish choirs, and much else of the same sort, shows that there is plenty of vigour for the office of precentor. But I would claim more than this—what a good precentor does is every precentor's *duty*; the cathedral must not be robbed of this source of influence; it is disappointing when work which is proper to her is being vigorously pushed elsewhere, and she is obscured. If such work does not originate with her, she should bring it to her, and head it. I should like to see the organizing officers of diocesan choral unions linked to the cathedral by some recognition or office under the precentor, he being the diocesan minister for music. So with the chancellor. All our dioceses are brimming over with educational zeal; it is astonishing how keen the thought, the forethought, and the action has become on this subject in the last few years. It is not an over-statement that definite religious instruction has been saved to the poor by diocesan zeal; but has it always been the chancellor who led the movement? or in the new foundations has the bishop found his chapter really his 'senatus' for this important branch of an educated Churchman's work? If not, I will plead that chapters must lead strongly the great movements which are coming up from the diocese, or they cannot fulfil their utility or maintain their influence. One method of perfecting the touch of the chapter on diocesan education would be that not only should the chancellor be chosen specially as an educationist, but that other officers of education should be brought into honourable connection with the chapter as long as they hold office; the cathedral must not leave the leading men outside.

If this view were held it would probably be necessary that the great offices of the *personæ* should only be held as long as the work can be done, and, further, that a considerable number of the non-residentiary stalls should be held on the same tenure.

But it does not follow irrevocably that a residentiary who relinquished one of the dignitaryships should also resign his canonry. Yet it is a problem, as we demand from a cathedral, or a parish, or a diocese, the full work of any office therein, to discover what should be done with men who are in advancing years or declining health, and the solution can never be satisfactory without a complete system of retiring pensions. This matter is vital to church reform; at present, the way is barred by very humanity, when we ask the older men who have perhaps been leaders in the fight to make way for those who throng behind. We cannot ask them to go into homelessness and poverty.

Nevertheless, in cathedrals, the dignitaryships might be transferred

when necessary to younger prebendaries, and the canonry retained by the older servants of the Church.

To such a course again there is a further consequence, it should follow that the greater chapter, if it were so employed in adding lustre to the cathedral, should have a wider influence in the cathedral's affairs. No doubt some matters (possibly finance) would be kept almost entirely still in the smaller chapter's hands; but there should be ways in which the considerable men whom I am supposing to be actively at work in the diocese, and feeling the pulse of that diocese in all its important affairs to the very end, should be able also to give the weight of their counsels to the chapter.

Were this so, the fact that the honorary canons are unpaid would cease to have the significance which is sometimes placed on it. The English clergy, though poor, value recognized responsibility as a higher honour than money, and soon the unworthy sneer that our residentiaries are the only *real* canons, because they are *paid*, would be impossible—residentiaries and non-residentiaries alike would be honourable in like degree for their *work's* sake.

I have spoken of the chancellor and education, but the same thought applies to the work of other members of chapter. Already we have the theological college under the walls of many cathedrals, and we are accustomed to look to the canons to lead us in higher religious education, in Church history lectures, in critical study of the Scripture, in university extension, not only in the cathedral city, but in the larger area; but there is yet another branch of Christian endeavour which is proper to cathedrals.

No old cathedral was without its works of pity. The great hospital of S. Thomas, which now faces the Houses of Parliament on the Lambeth bank of the Thames, owes its origin to the religious house of S. Saviour, Southwark. There is room to-day for the Church's initiative in tending and nursing the poor, specially in the villages. We must not let the cathedral be lacking in the honour of hospital work; either it should press this forward, or it should bring to itself those who are pressing it forward.

I trust that those who go with me will see that I am not imagining that all these works can be done by the small residentiary chapters—although some of them might, if the canons were permanently resident—nor, indeed, in all cases by the clergy; but I am pleading that by the use of prebendaries or honorary canons, by the close relationship of the chapter to the bishop, by the affiliation of women's work, and laymen's work, and other agencies which ought not to be beyond our invention, these works would be found to be part of the glories of our cathedral influence.

But here I must turn aside to a thought on patronage, because the filling of the offices obviously touches their after utility. The cathedral is founded for the diocese, not for individuals.

We have long learnt the responsibility of private patronage. A Church layman of thought knows now that the word patronage is a misnomer; it is rather a trust placed upon a man to appoint the right clergyman for the particular parish; no other idea of patronage can much longer be tolerable. Men, or public bodies, who maltreat the souls of a parish by sending to them a man for other reasons than

his fitness for *that* place (he being irremovable), have in my opinion sinned against Christ's Church.

The same principle should apply elsewhere. Bishoprics, deaneries, canonries, were not created to be the *patronage* of successful statesmen. There is only one arguable reason for such men holding such patronage, namely, that because of their exalted position we trust them to exercise their responsibility with a single eye to the *needs of the particular vacancy*. But if we hear of men being appointed to the first available benefice, not because that place needs that special man, but because he has rendered some *secular* service elsewhere, how can we be surprised if persons speak of the dwindling utility of the offices so filled?

S. Hugh of Lincoln and Grosseteste found that it called forth some of their toughness to resist pope or sovereign in his effort to reward his servants at the expense of the cathedral; but their resistance made the character and dignity of the chapter.

There is now but one more branch of cathedral influence which I have time to touch. It is the highest; it is her edification of spiritual life.

The first idea of a cathedral was missionary; it should be so still. We are proud of the parochial system, its freeholds, its securities for independence of thought and action, which have done no little to form the special character of the parish priest's life; but who shall say that there is no need, from time to time, of the appearance from outside of one who will stir and awaken. And to whom should that stirring be better entrusted than to the cathedral body? they whose life is conceived to be a high one of prayer and study. Again, to what parish does there not come *periods of opportunity?* The career of a parish is like the career of a soul in this: that there come special chances for the reception of the grace of God. Perhaps there has been an epidemic, or some unusual prosperity, I know not which, or how; but the spiritual perception of the people has been quickened. The parish priest, for no fault of his, may not be the man to take advantage of this; he may be already overburdened; he may even know his people too well. But if from the hearth, the focus of the diocese, a canon missioner, or one of the other canons gifted for these things, can come, who can limit "The utility of the Cathedral" for the cause of God? Under such revival of its old intention the cathedral will become more fully still the diocese's great church, not interfering with the parish churches, for the cathedral should never seem to be a bigger parish church, rivalling its neighbours, but supporting them, and supplementing too. Its courts will be filled. Quiet days, retreats for priests or people, for schoolmasters, merchants, women workers, mothers; opportunities for counsel, for public and private prayer and praise, will fill even the lesser chapels which surround the cathedral aisles, as thither the tribes go up.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. A. B. DONALDSON, Canon Residentiary of Truro.

IN discussing this subject, I venture to state a series of propositions as necessary conditions for true cathedral life and work.

(1) The cathedral city is, or ought to be, the real seat of the bishop; where he resides, and from which he directs the administration of the diocese.

(2) The bishop has, or ought to have, a real position in the cathedral church: and possesses not merely an ornamental throne, but the right to preach and officiate, according to definite regulations.

(3) The bishop summons and presides at chapter meetings, when necessary, and calls both the residentiary and greater chapters together to take counsel with them concerning the well-being of the diocese.

(4) The dean's office as ordinary president of the chapter is not thereby infringed upon or abolished, and the dean must not be turned into a suffragan bishop, or other wandering official, his presence being constantly required in the cathedral church and close, to superintend the worship, discipline, business, and deliberations of the cathedral body.

(5) The residentiary canons have definite offices and spheres of work, the ancient dignities of precentor, chancellor, treasurer, and sub-dean being, as far as possible, retained or revived, and such new offices as that of missioner being added, according to the needs of time and place.

(6) The residentiary canons give a large proportion of their time to residence in the cathedral close, attendance at divine worship, preaching in the cathedral church and other city churches.

(7) The work of the residentiary canons extends beyond the cathedral church throughout the diocese, and the worship, education, finance, and missionary work of the church is assisted, guided, and invigorated by their labours.

(8) The non-residentiary canons have a real, and not a mere ornamental position; but besides opportunities of preaching in the cathedral, they have, as members of the greater chapter, a voice in the distribution of capitular patronage, and in the election of the bishop and capitular proctor.

(9) Appointments to deaneries and canonries are made—(*a*) in recognition of theological and spiritual work already done for the Church, and—(*b*) to secure men who are really fitted for cathedral work. Selection should be based on fitness for a common life, as well as on individual ability, and altogether apart from political party or social connection.

(10) The dean and chapter of a cathedral should be perfectly united in aim and labour, and be animated by an intelligent appreciation of the importance of the worship and work of the Mother Church of the diocese. One at least of the secrets of the splendid success achieved at S. Paul's, London, is, that there were brought together as dean and canons, men, not only of great spiritual, theological, and oratorical gifts, but men who were thoroughly united in their zealous and wise enthusiasm to make their cathedral church a centre of light and life.

(11) The diocese must be brought to the cathedral, and the cathedral to the diocese. On the one hand, by having many large gatherings of choirs, church-workers, teachers, temperance, and other societies; on the other, by complying as far as possible with the demands made upon the cathedral for assistance by the scattered and isolated clergy. Last year in Cornwall help was given in various ways to the parish churches in one hundred and thirty instances; and the daily eucharist at

the cathedral altar, round which gather intercessions and thanksgivings from all parts of Cornwall, is felt to be a source of continued strength and unity to the whole diocese.

To turn to the second part of our subject, the maintenance of cathedrals. This is becoming a very grave question, not only for new cathedrals, but for those older ones whose endowments are, like those of the parochial clergy, shrinking to a very alarming extent. In new cathedrals it seems just that, where the original diocese is sufficiently well-endowed, and where the incomes have happily been fixed, and do not depend on agricultural conditions, not only should the Episcopal income contribute a certain quota towards the endowment of the new bishopric, but that appreciable deductions should (where possible) be made from capitular incomes to form a nucleus for the endowments of the new deans and chapters. There ought to be in each cathedral an adequate staff to maintain daily worship with dignity. Nothing is more likely to bring the cathedral system into contempt than to decorate a church with the title of cathedral, rebuild or restore it, and then take no steps to provide for its chapter or choir. Persons have been known to visit a cathedral and find it in the charge of a young curate, without any attempt at capitular residence or choral worship, and go away wondering at the lack of ecclesiastical statesmanship that can permit such an unreality.

It will, however, assuredly be necessary to appeal to the generosity of Churchmen and Churchwomen to endow and maintain our new cathedrals. It cannot be supposed that the zeal which has founded in the nineteenth century in England alone seven new sees (including Bristol), and restored many cathedrals at a cost of several millions. is exhausted. The dioceses of Liverpool, Newcastle, S. Albans, Southwell, and Truro (in part), cry out for such help. But humble efforts may be made to raise a fabric or maintenance fund. It may be as well to mention that, for six years past, a diocesan society called the Cathedral Union has been at work in Cornwall. It raises nearly £600 a year towards the maintenance of the fabric and services, which, without this aid, would be in sore distress. It has secretaries in each deanery, and its income is made up of subscriptions, collections in church, donations, etc. The cost of keeping the more ancient buildings in repair might possibly be materially assisted if parts of the cathedral were taken under the care of certain societies or guilds. It might be possible to assign a side chapel, a transept, or a crypt to the Foreign or Home Mission Societies, or other branches of diocesan work. They might contribute to its maintenance, and under regulations of the dean and chapter, use it for their devotional and festival gatherings.

And, surely, when claims are being made from all and every quarter for Sunday collections, it is only reasonable to expect that in many a diocese, as well as in that of Truro, a "Cathedral Sunday" should be a recognized institution.

The practical business-like qualities of the English-speaking races have already pronounced in favour of cathedrals by restoring and building them at enormous cost, both at home and abroad. It would be a poor compliment to those business-like qualities, to say nothing of the zeal and devotion of those races to God and His Church, to suppose that these splendid buildings will be allowed to fall back into decay and ruin, or to remain merely useless monuments of art, for lack of funds to maintain within and around them the work and worship which are the real purposes of their existence.

PAPER.

(2) Their Influence throughout the Diocese.

The Rev. George Venables, Rector of Burgh Castle, Suffolk; and Honorary Canon of Norwich Cathedral.

When, at the Birmingham Church Congress, two years ago, I stated that I felt certain it was the last Congress I should attend, I said what I meant, and I meant what I said.

My apparition to-day is not inconsistent with that statement; and moreover, I regard inconsistencies as splendid necessities sometimes. But I have not come again to Congress. Congress this time has come to me, or I had not been present at it. And, with humble and heartfelt gratitude to God, I regard it as His mercy to me that I am enabled to attend. Enough now of apology, for I do feel it is time to "get to work."

I am deeply oppressed, since looking closely into the subject, by a sense of the serious importance and solemn necessity of this enquiry. The attention of the whole Church needs to be awakened to the value of the capitular system.

I.—It is necessary, upon principle. Our magnificent cathedrals, differing in many particulars from all other structures, are splendid, architecturally, archæologically, and, above all, ecclesiastically. Our capitular theories, too, are and ought to be very other than parochial theories, but are at the same time far from inconsistent with the most perfect parochial organization. My belief is that the best condition of the whole Church will be attained when the capitular and the parochial are seen to be distinct parts of one great system, and when the smallest hamlet in any diocese shall experience (as I have often declared at our annual capitular meetings in Norwich Palace ought to be the case) the spiritual light and heat radiating from the cathedral, and shall reflect a glow of warmth and love back again to that common centre of the spiritual life and illumination of the entire diocese. Nothing less ought to content us. And if only the centre be all aglow (ah, this is most essential!), we may expect the fire and the heat will give forth their influences in every direction. I say that much ought to be done, and yet nothing without thought, and without a careful recognition of the cathedral ideal—nothing to lower the grandeur of the services, nothing to suggest the notion that the cathedral and the parish church are in the least degree antagonistic, or are intended for precisely the same purposes, or are in any way equal.

II.—They are, and they ought to be regarded as thoroughly distinct, and yet intended to work together for the benefit, not alone of the cathedral city, but also of the entire diocese. Cathedral buildings and apitular workers in them are greatly needed. And though much is doing in not a few instances, our capitular system ought to be effecting very much more than it is. It is sometimes asserted, indeed, that parochial clergy are jealous of the cathedral establishments. If the cathedral does little, its members are called "too exclusive"; if they strive to do much they get a hint not to be "so fond of interfering." I fear these feelings may exist, but I believe that they are rapidly on the

wane. Again, I well recollect hearing a religious man of great force and fervour, himself an honorary canon, the father of a zealous bishop of the northern province, say, in an address on Church matters, "What, you call the cathedral system a specimen of the union of Church and State! I call it the Church lying in State." I must confess that I did not contradict him. But that was many years ago, and the then suspected corpse proves to be alive, awaking as from a trance, and likely to prove a vitality of much strength and usefulness. Nor would England and Wales and Ireland have raised the large sums they have of late years freely bestowed for the erection and restoration of many cathedrals, unless they still were very dear to the hearts of the people. I say, therefore, as a matter of principle, the subject demands immediate attention. Surely, as a matter of policy, rapidity of action is desirable. In what I could not regard as anything less than an outrageous attack upon a portion of the Church a few weeks ago—the outcome of marvellous ignorance about Church matters—the cathedrals were looked upon as the most vulnerable part, whose very history, ancient and modern, however, demonstrated that they were not so open to injury as many had hoped. Notwithstanding this remarkable and encouraging truth, it would be very unwise not to make the people perceive and know that the cathedral is an essential part of the Church's system, and that the dwellers in every parish of a diocese should realize that it exists for their spiritual welfare and advantage.

A clergyman of good University position and much parochial experience, who has resided several years in a cathedral city as rector of a parish, has written to me—

"*A cathedral* should not try to be an additional parish church."

"*Canons residentiary* should act up to their title, and live by *rule* (brotherhood)."

"*Reside* permanently, not in idleness."

He hints, too, that it is quite possible so to *misapply* the energies of the cathedral body as to compete with, and hinder, parish organization.

III.—I would endeavour to secure much greater spiritual work through the cathedrals than some of them now accomplish. Yet, let not the most conservative of reasonable Churchmen be alarmed. I would conserve all that is good in the system, and of this there is a large store; but I would conserve it by using it immensely, and letting other folk know and enjoy the goodness thereof. This is a time of shaking, and, perhaps, only the things that cannot be shaken are to remain. I believe there is much in the capitular system that cannot be shaken, even if, perhaps, some few things can be removed with advantage. But still I will not blind your eyes with the dust of ecclesiastical vanity, or deceive you by words of an unhealthy confidence.

Is the daily office in cathedrals all it ought to be? Is it attended and valued as it is right it should be? If the reply be unsatisfactory, can no wise and right thing be done to improve it? I have known when the twice a day services of a large parish church were more frequented than those of the cathedral within twenty miles of it. Clergymen do, perhaps, hold their own opinions about "daily services"; but it is cruel to the individual himself, and unfair to the cathedral, if any one be chosen a member of any cathedral body to whom the daily offices and

frequent communions are not delightful and precious spiritual privileges. There be excellent and devout men, and ready speakers, and great preachers, who have no sympathy with the daily services of a cathedral; but there is a distinction between any minister who voluntarily goes about doing much good by a diligent use of his gifts, and him who, devoutly studying his cathedral statutes, endeavours quietly to do great, solid, enduring work by the hearty and faithful discharge of the duties of his cathedral position. It is no honour to the former to associate him with the capitular duties, and it is a serious hindrance to the capitular work if such a man is added to their body.

And I would ask you to consider, when and where in the Church's story was the capitular system working well throughout the dioceses, peacefully and harmoniously, to the glory of God, the best benefit of His Church, and the extension of the kingdom of heaven? Far am I from saying—nowhere, or never. But the times and the localities of such successes are, I fear, exceptional rather than general. It cannot be said, I submit, that the cathedral system has been anywhere productive of all the good that might have been expected from it.

Read that captivating book of 1870, by Dean Goulburn (but all his books are captivating, so I must give the title, viz., "The Cathedral System"). How delightful his ideal of the cathedral arrangements, and the ways in which they can all be advantageously carried out. How noble, and lofty, and holy are the sentiments breathed throughout that book, making one to shrink back ashamed at any thoughts inferior in sanctity to those suggested there. Or take that instructive and charming book of 1878, by the then earnest Bishop of Truro (now, by Divine providence, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury) on the cathedral. What more complete than his ideal of how all matters ought to be. But in these instances are we not almost too idealistic? May we hope to attain to a realization of the things herein proposed? I could not but feel while reading those two admirable books how great is the danger of much heartburning, of a lack of true love, and of the presence of envy and jealousy and impurity of motive.

Within the days of some of us—I appeal to my equals in age (of whom not very many are present), so as entirely to avoid the slightest reference to the last few years—what has been, in too many instances. the relationship between bishops, and deans, and the capitular bodies? Recollect that a body corporate of Christian ministers ought to feel, and to display, much more than a merely cold, formal abstinence from a not good feeling. If any body ought to abound in Christian love one towards another, and in Christian activity for the diocese, it is the body of men called to be saints who form the whole capitular corporation.

Now, common sense and true Christianity will make anyone a gentleman. But thorough Christian gentlemen, of whose Christianity there could be no doubt, and whose gracious manners were a fine illustration of Porson's saying, "Good manners is good morals," and of the motto of William of Wykham, "manners makyth man," have felt, and have owned, that the relations of a bishop and a dean to each other where each is, as each ought to be, full of zeal and anxious to preserve and promote the recognition of his rights and privileges, must be sometimes very greatly strained, demanding all possible self-denial and self-mastery, in order to the performance of the happy, loving

and consentient works which can be rightly done only where true unity and confidence are bound by true Christlike love.

The two only remedies, if remedy be needful, that have occurred to me, are both of them so distasteful to any whom I have consulted, that I shall not mention them. And the instances of "strained relation" to which I have alluded are of the past, although within my lifetime.

We all shall fully accord with a remark which has been vigorously pressed upon me by one who has had much to do with cathedral working, viz., that the men chosen for any office in connection with cathedrals ought to be men of true hearty piety, who can work well with others (which some good men cannot do), and who also do believe that the capitular and parochial systems hold valuable relationship towards one another, and are intended always to exhibit this. Let me here call to your recollection that the great and excellent Selwyn, bishop of New Zealand, and afterwards of Lichfield, felt very strongly the importance of well working the cathedral and the capitular system. I would also beg the attention of those interested in the subject to the weighty and judicious words of the judicious Hooker (Book vii., chap. viii.) They are very valuable, and should be studied. I here quote but three lines, where he says, "The Church where the bishop is set with his college of presbyters about him we call *a see;* the local compass of his authority we term a *diocese*." But the whole subject of making far more use of the capitular system demands and ought to receive great and immediate attention. It has been brought before Congress more than once, and it is now high time to go and do, to be up and doing.

"Tarry not," cries principle, "because the honour and glory of God and the spiritual good of men demand this." "Tarry not," cries policy, "do something wisely and speedily, because already the foe hath shown grim anxiety to destroy your very cathedral system and building, and, as far as possible, the Church itself." Oh, is not this the day then to demonstrate in a way that shall convince the people of the immense utility of the capitular system in every diocese?

A consideration then, of the two valuable works referred to, a study of the Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners for enquiring into the condition of cathedral churches in England and Wales, and with especial reference to Truro, the suggestions of some able men of experience who have assisted me in a most friendly way, added to my own observations, which for more than fifty years have been ardently directed (however incorrectly or uselessly) to the promotion of the Church of God in this land, cause me to offer the following thoughts to the attention of Congress. May they sink into oblivion if wrong. But, if right, I trust the Church may rise in every diocese and make the whole nation to know the great utility of the capitular and parochial systems in full force working together as they ought. Of course I must have free licence of speech. If anyone imagines in what I say I refer to anything personal, or local, or to any one bishop, or dean, or canon, residentiary or honorary, he will be utterly in error, because such an idea would be as baseless as it would be base. I speak honestly, but with sincere respect and regard.

I.—I think that a very useful, impressive, and sacred result would be secured, under the Divine favour, if, subject to wise regulations as to the seasons, the day, and the hours for such a function, the administration of "laying on of hands" in confirmation were to take place twice, at the

least, every year, in the cathedral of the diocese; at which any inhabitant of the diocese, under due parochial arrangement, should have the right to attend. It has long ago been recognized that the cathedral is lawfully the parish church of the whole diocese. I only beg that it may be so used. Possibly one of these two occasions should be strictly for persons over twenty or five-and-twenty years of age. I have seen occasions almost every year, when such a privilege would have proved of great help to the parish priest, and to many persons (especially elder) who would have gratefully availed themselves of such an opportunity. But it would cause many ever afterwards to feel a deep interest in their cathedral in which the chief pastor confirmed them in "the laying on of hands." I think much of this simple proposal.

II.—I must press home the importance and benefit of the diocesan bishop meeting the entire chapter at least once, or twice, yearly as the consultative body of and for the diocese. Prebendaries and honorary canons have not lost their wits, or their experience, or their readiness to consult together, because in the one case the prebend is gone, and in the other there never has been a prebend attaching to their stall in any way. Moreover, it appears that of old it was not unusual for many canons to be selected, who, although they received no income, or only a very small amount, and took no part in the management of the cathedral or its pecuniary resources, were in all other respects on common footing with the other canons, and proved to be of very great service in the performance of many excellent functions.

"It is an universal maxim of canonists" reported the Truro Royal Commissioners, "that neither the proper rank nor the spiritual functions of cathedral canons can be impaired by the non-endowment or deprivation or withholding of revenues from the stalls into which they are lawfully and canonically instituted and installed." They were equally consulted by the bishop in synod or in chapter with the other canons. Obviously a diocesan bishop can consult with any persons he may think proper to confer with: and of course he does consult with his deans rural respectively in the administration of the affairs in the locality of each respective rural dean.

But the spiritual necessities of the Church require, and ever required, a consultation by the bishop frequently with the capitular body, by which I mean the dean, the canons, residentiary and honorary, together with the archdeacons. The honorary canons know as much, if not more, of the condition and needs of rural and urban parishes than any. The idea has ever been that the bishop should rule the affairs of the Church, but on the principles of a paternal limited monarchy, or, in other words, by the bishop in council. And that council ought to be the capitular body as mentioned; while beyond doubt a diocesan synod ought to be occasionally held as well. I believe that much indolence, depression, and lack of spiritual life would have been hindered, if these principles had always been called into constant practice. And I now suggest that these things might speedily be accomplished. The difficulties can be easily surmounted if the will be good to overcome them.

III.—The government and management of the cathedrals ought to remain much as they are. The honorary canons have no right or desire to interfere with these. But in all other matters I submit that they can do great good service.

IV.—I think that as a rule no future residentiaries should hold any parochial charge. Their term of residence ought to be not less than eight or nine months yearly. In some instances their income sorely needs to be increased. I suggest also that they become "professors," for the purpose of extending and improving many important works and efforts in the whole diocese, by means of their lectures, teaching, and occasional special services within the cathedral, and possibly by sometimes giving instructions in distant parts of the diocese.

I suggest that one of the residentiary canons ought to be a professor and expositor of canon and ecclesiastical law, with the view of teaching for practical ends the powers of the canons, so that they may be carried out the better.

V.—In reference to the honorary canons, I believe that they also ought to do some good work in their cathedral for the benefit of the whole diocese. And while wishing to offer general thoughts rather than any very specified plans, let me respectfully say:—

(*a*) I think that three honorary canons should form a triumvirate professorship (the details to be left to themselves) for such purposes as, *e.g.*, a Sunday schools professorship, whereby they should be entitled to give lectures in the cathedral on certain days found to be suitable for those of the clergy who chose to attend, and for those of the laity, who, being duly constituted and appointed Sunday school teachers, would, as such, be alone entitled to attend such lectures, in which the art of good catechizing (in which I, and most of the clergy are woefully weak) should be especially attended to. Three honorary canons, giving perhaps six lectures amongst them in the year, might thus effect a great blessing from the cathedral throughout the entire diocese.

(*b*) There might be a professorship (also a triumvirate) for training, teaching, and instructing laymen to be (unpaid) lay agents in town, village, and hamlet. If each parish had its parish-room or hall for all sorts of good moral purposes, where laymen could hold Sunday schools, and conduct (with a proper book) a lay service and exhortation, it would do more to awaken the masses and promote union than anything. A chancel well defined and shut off except for services by the parish priest should be added to such a parish room. I believe many laymen would be found "apt to learn" how to conduct these services, if some canons "apt to teach" would instruct them. Are there not many side chapels, spaces, and silent nooks in our cathedrals where these and many similar efforts may be made? People from all parts of a diocese will come, if only suitable times and conditions be secured.

(*c*) Much in the same way, there might be (I use the similar term for the sake of convenience, but another term may be preferable) "capitular professors" of (suppose) (1) Church history, to give clear, popular, accurate teaching of the Church of the present time, and also of the earlier ages. (2) Professors of deaconesses for the diocese, including nurses. (3) Professors bound yearly to give a few lectures to the clergy and the laity upon the laying on of hands in confirmation, and how to prepare the young candidates for that sacred and often blessed rite.

(*d*) Ought not every cathedral body to possess among its canons one or more professors of congregational singing and psalmody, not to teach a choir to sing in the presence of an admiring, or gaping, or criticizing congregation, but to teach the whole congregation, in village as much as

in town, to lift up heart and soul in one united voice of glory to God?

(*e*) There are many more good purposes to which I think the attention, study, and labours of honorary canons might be given. It would call them up from their parishes a few days only each year. It would be most delightful and improving exercise to them, and if well planned to suit people of the diocese as to times, seasons, and hours, it would be of extreme benefit to the parishes, who would begin to find that the cathedral did exist for them, at least to some extent, and the array of clergy connected with the great central building of the diocese laboured for the benefit of every parish within it.

(*f*) There seems no reason why, in giving effect to these suggestions, a residentiary canon might not be associated with two or more of his honorary brethren whenever it seemed desirable. And, further, it seems to me that, in some instances, these brethren may think fit to re-produce their lectures and instructions specially as to singing in a few other parts of the diocese, although for the most part endeavouring to render the cathedral the chief central place of assembly and instruction.

VI.—Some years ago I was in Antwerp Cathedral, and was rather astonished to see a closely-packed reverent congregation of, perhaps, two hundred people gathered within a small portion of that interesting building, who appeared to be reciting some kind of litany. I learned afterwards that this was a service allowed for the benefit of the Walloon folk of the neighbourhood, and that the service was conducted generally by a layman.

Methinks that there could be found laymen if necessary, and, surely, canons honorary, and other persons in holy orders, who would rejoice to help in an arrangement to afford the 100,000 people of Norwich, and the people from the country who frequent that city, some such ministration here. And the same idea would apply in S. Paul's, London, and in nearly every one of our cathedral cities. They might not be successful everywhere. But if the service be what is wanted, and some lay folk will go out into the highways, market places, and alleys, and invite the people, why not succeed here as in Antwerp?

Imagine a number of our poorest, most ignorant, and almost hopeless class, being made to understand that at a certain part of every cathedral, at a certain hour suitable to them, there would be a simple brief litany, just adapted to their case, possibly even sometimes an *extempore* prayer, a five minutes' teaching, and, perhaps, the singing a hymn. The whole to be for them, and for them exclusively.

Is it too much for the imagination? Then ignore imagination, and *try the proposal.* What a field for the Brotherhood of S. Andrew!

VII.—Ought there not to be in each cathedral, somewhere within quire and chancel, a place, sufficiently shrouded from the gaze of others, while sufficiently public to hinder possibility of the scandal of those who cherish scandal as the business of their lives, in which all day long, earnest men and women may separately have opportunity for brief or lengthy periods of supplication, meditation, and prayer, and where some may experience the promise, "Thou shalt hide them privily by Thine Own presence from the provoking of all men: Thou shalt keep them secretly in Thy tabernacle from the strife of tongues"?

Let it be *ever* felt that the cathedral is not a "show place" merely, but is essentially, and practically, and *continuously*, "God's House of Prayer."

God forbid that it ever again can be written what I here copy as attributed to Coleridge over fifty years ago. He described a cathedral as "petrified religion." Or, as another stated about ten years since—"In the continuous round of their formal services, the sheltering vine, or the daily manna will be sought in vain. Fervent devotion and spiritual worship seemed to be congealed in the depths of their long-drawn aisles. All life dies—death lives." There is something very unjust or unfair or ignorant in this, but it is a pity that it should have been possible even for an enemy to have suggested such a criticism.

It may be thought that even with the proposals which I have thus ventured to offer, the usual difficulty about funds will stay all proceedings. Now, we may depend upon it, that much *must* be done, and done *quickly*, and yet *well*.

But the greater part of my suggestions could, I think, be gradually put into operation without any vast outlay. I feel sure that, temporary hospitality being found, the honorary canons would gladly do their full share to make a beginning. Possibly a "Shunammites' House," kept, too, by a "*Churchman*," might be provided, as in Richard Hooker's time, though without his domestic experience! (pp. 16-19, Oxon., 1845, of Hooker's works.) If this be done, and it was seen that the plans were likely to prosper, there is that happy clause introduced and carried by our much-missed deeply-esteemed friend, A. J. B. Beresford Hope in the cathedral laws, by which honorary canonries may, at any time, be endowed even with a very little sum. And is it too much to suppose that in every diocese a few endowments will be provided when the utility and necessity of them shall have been demonstrated?

If the Churchmen of Great Britain gave one tenth, aye, one twentieth (one shilling in the pound), of their annual income to godly purposes in the Church at home, or if one fortieth (one sixpence in the pound), of a Christian Churchman's yearly income were so given, the product would far exceed all that is required for all the spiritual necessities of the land. And I believe that if only the laity perceive that the capitular body needed small endowments for canons carrying out such works as I have mentioned, and that they were doing good, the endowments would be forthcoming. A modest sum for each honorary canon's proposed professorship (some £40 to £60 a year) would suffice. But, in the very beginning, I think the work must be done without any income whatever.

To bring all these rather desultory remarks to a conclusion. I have preferred to offer general, practical, and I deem practicable, suggestions, rather than to proclaim (what is not needed) a ruthless reform, or any too well cut and dried proposals.

Very much more is hardly possible until the capitular reform of 1840 be regarded as being in many particulars a terrible blunder, and unless some salaries be secured to the many useful and really diligent workers around these noble temples.

But I conclude with the persuasion that even as we are, the cathedral building and the cathedral corporation can do very much more than most at present do to promote spiritual life and light; beginning always at the cathedral structure as the centre, but by its plans,

organizations, and attractions, so aiding and teaching the people in the remotest hamlet, that they should have many just reasons for talking with pleasure and gratitude of "*our cathedral.*"

(1) Much I feel convinced would come out of two annual confirmations in the cathedral, besides the general confirmation, for the whole diocese. One at least annually, for adults only, would prove of much use.

(2) Very much of the bishop treating the capitular body as the bishop's councillors for the diocese in many particulars, and by an occasional diocesan synod.

(3) Lengthened residence for the residentiary canons is very desirable, and where needful with increased incomes. These canons to have no parochial charge beyond the precincts, but to be professors, giving lectures, and also going forth during a part of their time as preachers and teachers.

(4) Then the honorary canons ought to hold in commission some useful duties as professors, giving good practical teaching to clergy and to laity.

(5) Let gatherings be held within the cathedral for (suppose) solemn days of spiritual instruction, not always for the clergy alone, but for others. Suppose such a season on the "Transfiguration Day" of our Lord.

(6) Gatherings also for special spiritual services under well-defined regulations, wherein *(Psalm* 65 i.—*Praise in silence is given unto God)* a part of the function shall be a portion of time to be spent by every one present kneeling in silence for prayer, praise, and meditation, and for thinking, and for thanking God. This was once an occasion of great spiritual power amongst the Society of Friends. "The priesthood of the laity" is a popular phrase with many. Perhaps it might be exhibited on some of these occasions. I do not see why at certain conferences in the cathedral they may not, like the Jews of old, "say on." Every word spoken by Jesus Christ, in Synagogue or Temple, was uttered by Him in His simple right as a non-excommunicated, Jewish, Layman!

May the parochial clergy and the people treat and regard the capitular body of their diocese as a part of their own, and of the whole ecclesiastical system; and may the capitular body increasingly secure the favour, love, and confidence of parochial clergy and people too. It never ought to be otherwise. It is for the good of all so to be.

Imagine one united Church, in which from highest to lowest, whether of laity or of clergy, the great object shall be, as one mighty brotherhood, Dissenters gladly returning and heartily welcomed back, to advance the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, promoting the spiritual benefit of every one, unhampered by personal motives, undimmed by the wretched dust of rivalry or ambition, the only strife being the striving together in prayer. True it is that even in the presence of Jesus the capitular body was not free from ambition. But since that time the day of Pentecost has *fully* come, and we all ought to be of *one* mind, each in *his* place: and under the teaching of the Holy Ghost, there ought ever to be—order, energy, and love. And then, I ween, these systems would be found working most heartily together, the capitular system saying to the parochial, and the parochial system saying to the capitular—"*I have hearty need of thee.*"

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. N. J. DEVEREUX, Vicar of S. Mary's, Hoxton.

I, *as* a vicar of a very poor parish in the East End of London, would not have intruded were it not that the speakers hitherto have, every one of them, been members of the Cathedral body; and therefore I should like to say what I have to say as an extra-cathedra member of society. I have often asked myself as a hard-working clergyman—as I hope I am—what all these canons and deans do, and what they exist for. I am told by some that their places exist as places of retirement for those who have worked hard in the field of the Church; by others that they are places where learned men can pursue their learning; and others have held that they should be centres for men engaged in acts of usefulness, such as Canon Venables has so very beautifully and pathetically put before you. I am bound to say, that so far as I can see, they have been chiefly used as places of retirement; and I ask myself, are the holders of these offices persons who are fit to retire? Very often these gentlemen are only in middle age, and have plenty of work left in them. Very often I find that besides holding one of these positions, say a canonry, they also hold a large living, and I cannot help saying that I think this is a grave reflection upon our mode of appointment in the English Church. No doubt many eminent men are appointed, notably Dean Goulburn, the late Dean of Norwich, than whom no one has done more for the Church by his writing, his learning, and the splendid work he has done for the diocese and the city of Norwich. But when I look around me in these cathedral cities, do I find this devotional "life" of which we have heard so much this afternoon from the readers of the papers? I think it was Dean Hook who once said that the cathedral "close," instead of being a centre of charity, was rather the home of "envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness." I do not know that that is so, but take even the case of the city of Norwich. At the Working Men's Meeting the other evening, Lord Meath advised the fathers in the room to see that their sons had plenty of open air, sports, and cold water, and I thought it was with somewhat of irony that a man at the end of the room ventured to say, "We have no wash-houses and baths, my lord, in Norwich." I say that the city of Norwich itself is as unsanitary a place as you can imagine, and I hope we shall all go home without typhoid fever.

The Very Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

I MUST ask Mr. Devereux, with all liberality, however, to refrain from attacking the corporation whose guests we are.

The Rev. N. J. DEVEREUX.

WELL, I retract that with all sincerity. But I am not attacking the corporation, because I understand they wish to do their best, and are raising £60,000 for the resanitation of the place. One of the speakers this afternoon has advocated the case of retirement. That has been advocated not merely in this room, but elsewhere during this Congress. Well, I cannot help thinking that if some really good mode of retirement, such as there is in the army, were applied, not merely to the vicars, but also to the bishops, deans, and canons, it would be a very advantageous thing indeed. With regard to what one of the speakers said of the cathedrals as promoting good and high-class music, I should like to say, that a great professor of music who went over from our Church to join the Church of Rome, when he had his interview with Cardinal Manning, said he felt sorry that he had been so long in placing his services at the disposal of that Church; and Cardinal Manning's words in reply were, "You need not be at all sorry. Roman Catholic though I am, I will tell you that the Anglican Cathedral music of the English Church is the finest that has ever been produced, and I will only be too pleased if you can work on its lines." I will only, in conclusion, say that a magnificent opportunity has, by the last Parliamentary decision, been given, not merely to the Cathedral body, but to the whole Church of England, of setting her house in order; and if the Church in the next six years does that, she will be stronger than ever to resist attack. But if on the contrary she folds her hands and does nothing, the cry for Disestablishment and Disendowment will be louder than ever, and I for one will hold up my hands for both.

The Rev. R. J. DUNDAS, Rector of Albury, Surrey; Hon. Canon of Winchester.

I REALLY only want to make one particular suggestion, and that is with respect to the cathedral patronage. You are aware, no doubt, that those who are what I think the Bishop of Southwark has said people called "the useless people"—the "greater" chapter of the cathedral—have no voice in the disposal of patronage. Nor do I think it necessary that they should have. I cannot conceive a better body to administer the patronage of a cathedral than the dean and residential canons. But if so, the patronage should be administered by the whole body, that is to say, that the custom which prevails in some English chapters of dividing up the patronage, assigning so much of it to the senior member of the chapter, so much to the next, and so on, ought not to be allowed. And for this reason, that when we speak of the influence of the cathedral upon the diocese, surely it means the influence of the chapter as a whole, otherwise those appointed to the cathedral livings are simply the representatives, not of the combined counsel and judgment of the whole chapter, but of the one individual who has appointed them. That is, I think, one change that ought to be made in respect to the distribution of patronage. I was glad to hear from more than one speaker their own opinion about the use of the greater chapter. I am thankful to say that it is creeping in much more than in former years. Our late Bishop of Winchester—a singularly holy and gifted man—was, I think, the first Bishop of Winchester to call the greater chapter into practical existence. He brought them together twice in the year to take counsel with the dean, canons residentiary, and himself in matters concerning the diocese. No doubt the more the greater chapter is called into requisition the greater will be the value of the whole chapter, and the greater will be the influence of the cathedral establishment upon the diocese at large.

SAMUEL HOARE, Esq., M.P. for Norwich.

ONE of the difficulties of the arrangements of a Congress is, that one wants to attend all the meetings at the same time. I have been obliged to attend at another place, where a subject of great interest has been under consideration; and I have not heard the discussion on this platform. I am afraid, therefore, that any suggestion I make may simply be a repetition of what has already been said to you. I feel very strongly that we do not get in the Church half the advantage we ought to get from so important a body as the dean and chapter in our cathedral cities. We are fortunate in Norwich, especially in my good friend, the dean, in our chapter. But when we talk about having more power in the Church, I always think that in the dean and chapter we ought to have a very powerful body, not only to work in the city, but throughout the diocese. I wish there was some plan, as in some dioceses, whereby the dean and chapter might—if I may say so—act as cabinet ministers in the dioceses. In appointing his canons, the bishop appoints the canon to be a resident canon in the diocese, and to devote his time to the work. To whichever canonry he goes, he has certain work to take up, whether it be education, or the examination of candidates for the ministry, or whatever it is. I have thought, in these discussions, that we might have—I do not say a perfect body, but a body who would be most useful in the diocese—in the dean and chapter; and we might go so far (I am Radical enough to suggest the change) as to include laymen upon the committee when matters concerning the diocese have to be discussed. I was one of the first to be appointed to represent this diocese in the House of Laymen. But might we not do something for the diocese at home, during the Parliamentary recess, when we have less to do? I should hope, also, that there would be a canon ready from time to time to undertake important or even small services in our large and small parishes, and that it would be possible for some of our distinguished canons to come and help us. I know that the dean agrees with me in seeking to do all he can in this diocese. I think that a great and grand work has been done in our cathedral city. It is a grand thing to see our cathedral so vastly improved from what it was; and there has not been a single visitor to Norwich—not even the gentleman who did not seem quite satisfied with the primitive streets—who has not been satisfied with our great cathedral. Thank God we have such a monument of the work of the dean and chapter in our own diocese.

H. COOPER PATTIN, Esq., M.D., Medical Officer of Health for Norwich.

I AM not going to be drawn away from the point at issue by the very palpable red herring which has been trailed across my path by a previous speaker. I appear here as an unofficial representative of that long-suffering body, the laity of the Church of England, to say how in my judgment the cathedrals may make their influence most beneficial throughout the diocese. I should say at once that among the qualifications which seem to be desirable to the residential members of the capitular body should be that most important power—the power of effective preaching. The canons are not required to do parochial work; they are not cumbered with the charge of parishes; but they should be a peripatetic preaching body, progressing throughout the diocese. The congregations at cathedral services are chiefly made up of people who do not as a rule attend the services of their parish churches. Many of them go to the cathedral largely because the musical portion of the service is more attractive and elevated, but I believe many more because the preaching in the parish church is not acceptable to them. It consequently becomes a matter of practical importance that in this extra-parochial institution, the cathedral, the preaching power of its officers should first be considered, and not only in the cathedral, but that they should be expected to use their power and make progressions through the diocese, and preach when required by the bishop, or requested to do so by the parochial clergy. He alone who has to sit, as I have done for years in succession, and listen to the teachings of one or two spiritual pastors, knows the delight and relief it is to get a new preacher, and one of a different order in the pulpit. My father was a staunch supporter of the Church, and when I was a lad I had to attend church three times a day, and listen always to two, and often three sermons. Being an observant person, I at last got to know every movement our old vicar used to make, and even the words that would follow the particular movement. There nearly always occurred, for example, at some stage of the sermon this passage: "Where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest," and I knew when these words were coming by a certain sidelong dip of the head. Well, you can imagine the delight it was to get a new preacher. No one who has to control and direct the organization of a parish can be expected to preach really well twice a day on fifty-two days in the year. It should not be expected of the parochial clergy; and it seems to me that in the members of cathedral chapters we have a means of providing the people with what they do want, namely, good preachers; the lack of whom is causing the Church of England the loss of more members than anything else. The complaint I get from members of the laity is this—we should go to the Church very much oftener if they would only preach better. I have listened, in my experience, to some two thousand odd sermons preached by archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons; and I cannot recollect a tenth of them that were really good. I can, however, recollect only too many that recalled to me Milton's words, "The hungry sheep look up and are not fed." The way our cathedrals can have the greatest influence on the laity of the Church of England, then, lies in this direction, namely, in making the power of preaching, and of preaching effectually, the primary qualification in those who are elected to the capitular offices.

The Rev. Wm. WALTER KIRBY, Rector of Barnsley; and Hon. Canon of Wakefield.

I REPRESENT—and I think I am the only representative here—Wakefield, and as that is one of the newly-made bishoprics or dioceses, perhaps I may be allowed to say that, when we were told, after I had been ten years in the diocese of Ripon, that we must raise £70,000 before we should have that large diocese divided, many people held up their hands and said it would be impossible. But we found that it was not impossible, and the diocese of Wakefield was formed. And I think it is in accordance with this afternoon's discussion, if I say that I believe the formation of that diocese, and the increase by one of the cathedrals of this land, has been of the greatest advantage to the Church at large in the thickly-populated West Riding of Yorkshire. And, although I belong to a cathedral where we possess only honorary canonries, I think it would be a monstrosity to raise money to endow these canonries. I should be very sorry if it were done. Plenty of men of parochial experience feel it an honour,

as a reward, to be a canon of their cathedral, and to be called upon to do the work of their office; but I quite agree with the last speaker, and think there might be an order of preachers. I think I could follow the Roman Catholics in that matter, although I am not generally very anxious to follow them; but such an order would be a great relief to the heavily taxed clergy themselves, and to their congregations. I know I am always glad when someone comes to preach for me—many of them can do it very much better than myself. I choose the best men I possibly can, as assistants; those who have a good voice, as well as a good heart, and are likely to preach Christ and Him crucified fully. I must say, however, I do not think that preaching is everything. Thank God! there will be in heaven many a pastor who had no gift for preaching, but who was with his people in their times of sickness and of trouble, and who sympathized with them in their distress. We must also not forget that the Lord Himself reminded us of other duties, when He said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel," adding, "Baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," and also ordained the other sacrament when He brake bread and said, "Do this in remembrance of Me." There are other "means of grace" besides preaching, and therefore do not always be too hard on the preacher, for while you think you know what they ought to say from the pulpit, you in the pews forget what you ought to do. I congratulate the dean upon looking so well, and I am sure his strength of body, as well as of heart and soul, will enable him to begin the good work which he has suggested for the relief of the distressed clergy.

The Very Rev. the CHAIRMAN.

I NEVER was so sorry to be in the chair, because I wanted to say something about cathedrals. Some of the Speakers seem to have forgotten that we deans and chapters are bound by statutes which nothing but an Act of Parliament can alter.

The Rev. VINCENT T. KIRBY, Cape Colony.

SOME allusion has been made to the work of the cathedrals in our Colonial Churches, and having worked in one of those Colonial Churches, I think that I can say a little about them. In this, as in some other matters, I think the Colonial Churches can set an example to the home Churches. The Colonial Churches of course have not the wealth, and consequently have not the power of doing what is done in some of the English cathedrals. The musical services cannot be maintained with the same efficiency and regularity; but in other points—two especially—I think we have something to learn at home from the Colonial cathedrals. The first is about the chapter as the council of the bishop. That has already been urged as a desirable thing here: but it is in actual operation in the Church of South Africa. It is appointed by several of the synods to look after various matters, and notably the matter of patronage. There the bishop acts almost universally with the advice of his chapter; and I remember at Capetown last year the bishop prominently putting forward his chapter as his advisers in matters which the chapter would willingly have left him to deal with alone. The chapter is also, secondly, the centre of life and worship; and one thing that would help to make the English cathedrals more a centre of life would be to restore the diocesan synods. There is another point which is unfortunately very seriously wanting in our cathedrals. I believe that in the whole of England there are only two cathedrals in which there is a daily celebration of the Holy Communion—S. Paul's and Truro ("Worcester," "Chichester"). Well, at all events, the number is very small; but in South Africa there are five cathedrals and one pro-cathedral on the mainland, and all of these, save one, has a daily celebration, and with regard to that one exception, I do not know whether it is a coincidence or a cause, but the bishop does not reside close to the cathedral, but some six or seven miles off. That is the metropolitan cathedral of Capetown. With their small staffs and little money, the Colonial cathedrals are able to maintain the daily celebration of the Holy Communion. A great deal more might be done in the same direction by the English cathedrals, and then they would become much more really centres of life and work than at present. In these points I think we have much to learn from the Colonial Churches.

ASSEMBLY ROOM.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 11TH, 1895.

Sir FRANCIS BOILEAU, Bart., in the Chair.

THE CHURCH'S CARE OF

(1) THE DEAF AND DUMB.

(2) WAIFS AND STRAYS.

PAPER.

(1) THE DEAF AND DUMB.

The Right Rev. HENRY WARE, D. D., Bishop Suffragan of Barrow-in-Furness.

THE Christian people of England acknowledge the duty of promoting foreign missions to the heathen, but they are not alive to the fact that among ourselves there is a race of men debarred from most of the intellectual and religious advantages which we ourselves possess. The deaf and dumb, unless specially cared for, are a sort of involuntary heathen in the midst of a Christian country. Our ordinary means of grace do not touch them. They are cut off from all that intercourse with others by which our elementary ideas of religion and morality are formed almost unconsciously. If not specially educated, they do not know the English language; they do not even understand what language *is*—language in which, though it be not spoken aloud, *we* habitually think and reason. Thus they are far more strangers to all our ideas and modes of thought, far more isolated from us, than any foreigners could be who were dropped down in the midst of us without knowing a word of the English language. Yet they have, in most cases, the full intellectual faculties which we possess, if only these can be trained and developed.

Perhaps our sympathy with them is not aroused because they *look* just like other men. We see a blind man in the street, and our feelings are stirred at once by the sight. We meet a deaf mute, and he does not attract our notice. Yet he is far more to be pitied. It is probable that many here have such persons as neighbours, living in the same parish or village, and are not aware of the fact. It may be taken as a sufficient guide for practical purposes, that about one person in every two thousand is a deaf mute*; and they are scattered pretty uniformly among the rural and urban populations throughout the kingdom.

It is not my purpose now to speak of the education of deaf mutes in schools or institutions, except so far as may be necessary to make clear what should be done for them in their after life. But, as many of those who hear me have probably very little knowledge of the subject, I must explain that we can communicate with them in three ways:—

(*a*) By means of the finger alphabet, with which many of you will be

* The total population of England and Wales at the last census was 29,002,525. The census gave 14,192 deaf and dumb persons. There are reasons for thinking that this is rather below the real number.

acquainted. But this, of course, implies that they have learnt to read and spell the English language.

(*b*) By a language of signs, founded upon the natural or instinctive signs by which they express their needs and feelings. Such signs represent, not syllables or words, but ideas, and might be to some extent understood even by those who have not learnt the English or any other language.

(*c*) There is the oral (or German) system, by which the deaf mute is actually taught to speak, for (you know) he is only dumb because he has not learnt to speak (as we have) by hearing others; and he is taught to understand what is said to him by watching the motions of the lips. When this last plan can be carried out, it is the most perfect system of teaching; by it the deaf mute is less isolated, and placed more nearly on a level with other people. But it implies a long and laborious training, and considerable quickness on the part of the pupil. And though its advocates regard it as *the* system of the future, few of those deaf mutes with whom we have to deal at present have learnt it to any effect. Out of about two hundred and twenty on our register in the diocese of Carlisle, there is not one, except our missionary himself, who has learnt it to much practical purpose; and he was not deaf from birth, but became so in early childhood. In addresses or religious services we must use chiefly signs. For such purposes not even spelling on the fingers can be largely employed: to follow it for a length of time, and at a little distance, would be too great a strain on the eyesight.

Now think of the case of a deaf mute who has been trained for five or six years at one of the many excellent institutions maintained for the purpose. At the end of this education he goes home, perhaps at the age of fifteen or sixteen years, to make his living and to lead his life. He finds himself very isolated. Most persons around are quite unable to communicate with him; sometimes they are unkind to him. He becomes sad and lonely, often much depressed. Often he gradually loses much that he has been taught; he falls back intellectually and morally, sometimes into grievous habits of sin. Such is the sad history of many a deaf mute. In the words of an excellent paper by Mr. Muir, himself a deaf mute, at the Congress of the British Deaf and Dumb Association, "On the completion of the school term of education the deaf go out into the world, and then there arises the necessity for a special provision for their religious instruction and worship. When no such provision is made for them, they generally lead careless and ungodly lives, and through the want of a constant supply of spiritual food the soul often sinks into apathy."

The parochial clergy cannot deal with such cases. Without exceptional training they have no means of getting into touch with them. It is the obvious duty of the Church not to neglect the pastoral care of these helpless ones, and it is absolutely necessary to have specially trained missionaries to deal with them. How, then, can this best be done? In my reply to the question, I must be chiefly guided by experience gained as Chairman of the Committee for carrying out such a Mission in the Diocese of Carlisle.

(1) The work should be taken up by us Churchmen on definitely Church lines. For myself, I have no great belief—nor, probably, have the great majority of members of this Congress—in what is called

"undenominational" religious work. It is quite true that the religious teaching given, and the services held, must be for the most part of a very simple character. As in the case of young children, most of it would be accepted by almost any body of Christians believing in the great truths of the Apostles' creed. But we must have some definite standard of teaching; we must bring children to baptism; we must instruct candidates for Confirmation; we must give simple preparation for Holy Communion, and from time to time help the deaf mutes to attend it and follow the service. And, indeed, Holy Communion, in which the Lord's death is shown forth, not in word only, but in action also, is a service peculiarly adapted for the use of the deaf. Practically, if Churchmen begin the mission as a Church work, little difficulty will be found with Protestant Dissenters. Fixed forms of worship are obviously better suited for the deaf than the Nonconformist manner of worship, and from their difficulty in taking in abstract ideas, they appear to require very clear and *definite* teaching, even beyond other people. Roman Catholics will not attend our services; but in many ways we can help and be on friendly terms with all.

(2) Such a mission should, if possible, be *diocesan*, carried on with the sanction, and under the control of the bishop of the diocese. Thus it becomes in harmony with, and reaps the full advantage of, that parochial system which is the strength of the Church of England. The parish priest should know, or can find out, any deaf mutes in his parish, however much they may shrink from observation, or be kept in the background by their relatives, as is sometimes the case. The missionary comes, not taking the matter out of the parish priest's hands, but acting under his direction, and in concert with him in that which, for want of technical knowledge, the priest cannot do for himself; and, as a rule, the clergy are found to be willing helpers.

(3) With regard to the missionary himself. Such missions are often carried on successfully by hearing people whom circumstances have led to acquire the necessary familiarity with the sign language. It would be presumptuous in me to speak of such work as that so long done by the Rev. Dr. Stainer in London, Dr. Buxton in Manchester, and many others. To some of these I owed most of my own information when my attention was first turned to the subject. Some of you may be able to visit S. Saviour's Church for the Deaf and Dumb in Oxford Street, London, of which the Rev. F. W. G. Gilby is now Assistant Chaplain, and you will see for yourselves what can be done. But a deaf mute, who has received a superior education, and is thoroughly conversant with the language of signs, is often found to be an excellent missionary to his fellow deaf. He is in entire sympathy with them, and they with him; he knows their needs; he knows how much they understand and can follow. And if his own infirmity places him in some respects at a disadvantage, he can be greatly assisted by kindly sympathy on the part of those who have the management of the mission. There is, however, great need of some thorough and systematic training for the work.

It is very desirable that the missionary should hold the licence of the bishop as a lay reader. In America several deaf mutes have been admitted to Holy Orders, and act as missionaries to their brethren; in England one has been admitted to the diaconate. Doubts may be,

of course, felt as to the wisdom of this course; and obviously there are grave reasons why such an infirmity should be an obstacle to admission to the priesthood. But the question cannot be adequately discussed in the brief limits of such a paper as this, and it is rather one for the consideration of our diocesan bishops than for discussion at a Church Congress.

(4) It is obvious that the practical working of missions to the deaf and dumb must be very different in the great centres of population, and in dioceses where there are no great cities and the deaf mutes are scattered over a wide agricultural district. In the Diocese of Carlisle the missionary makes the circuit of the diocese every month, holding Sunday services monthly in the chief towns—Carlisle, Kendal, Barrow, Workington, and Whitehaven. The hours of the services are so arranged that he can accompany the communicants of his flock to the celebration of Holy Communion in some Church; and on the weekdays he visits the sick, and gathers a few together in the villages and smaller places. At each centre we also try to arrange occasional gatherings of deaf mutes, and weekly classes for those whose education has been defective. For this purpose the help of friends, generally ladies, is sought; and, under the superintendence of the missionary, many such persons are becoming interested in the work, and, if not previously able to use the finger alphabet, are learning to do so. Some of the better educated deaf mutes themselves thus help their less fortunate companions; and we have received frequent testimony to the greater brightness and cheerfulness which has been thus brought into the life of both the teachers and the taught. It is our endeavour also to establish a system by which every deaf mute may have some hearing friend personally connected with him or her by a bond somewhat like that which unites associates and members of the Girls' Friendly Society. Our chief difficulty arises from the sad fact that at the present time nearly one-third of the adult deaf mutes in the Diocese of Carlisle have received little or no education. With some few it seems almost impossible to enter into communication at all. Others understand only the simplest natural signs. The excellent legislation of two years ago, making education for the deaf and dumb compulsory, and imposing upon School Boards, or Boards of Guardians, the duty of enforcing it, and of contributing to the cost when necessary, will (we may hope) gradually get rid of the difficulty. As yet, it is sometimes found that these authorities are hardly aware of their duties and powers, and have little knowledge of schools to which such children may be sent; but they are generally well-disposed in the matter, and welcome assistance in getting the children into suitable institutions.

In conclusion, let me earnestly urge Churchmen to awake more thoroughly to their duty towards these their afflicted brothers and sisters. In some parts of England the Church has been sadly behindhand. In the north of England, indeed, a good deal has been done; in fact, something in every diocese or county within the Northern Province. Thus, in several districts there are Church missions; in others, missions which (if not directly connected with the Church) are worked chiefly by Churchpeople, and are doing an excellent work. In other districts again there are missions conducted on undenominational lines. From our point of view of course this is the less excellent way, but where it

is in possession of the field it may not be easy to alter the system, though Churchmen should at least try to do something to supplement it. In the Southern Province there has long been an excellent mission for the Winchester Diocese, and I am thankful that we are to listen to its honorary secretary, Canon Owen, to-day. In London, the Royal Association—of which Canon Owen is also honorary secretary—has several churches or mission rooms. There are missions also in Staffordshire, Shropshire, and Derbyshire; while in Bristol, and one or two other towns, there are undenominational missions, which appear to be chiefly under the management of Dissenters. At the present time a mission is being taken in hand for the Diocese of Lincoln, and I have heard that one is in contemplation for the Diocese of Truro. But, as a whole, the Southern Province is far behind the Northern. With the exceptions which I have mentioned, neither Churchmen nor Dissenters appear hitherto to have undertaken any systematic work for the deaf and dumb in most of our Midland, Southern, or Eastern Dioceses. Surely the National Church ought not to neglect such a task as this. The work is waiting for us to do it. If we neglect it, other religious bodies may step in and take it up, and then the Church will not readily be able to recover the lost opportunity of doing her duty; but, if so, it will be owing to our apathy and neglect. None can do it as well, as easily, as usefully, as Churchmen; and I trust that one result of this Church Congress will be to stir up greater interest in the subject, and that some of these sad gaps may be ere long filled.

NOTE.—So far as I have been able to ascertain, no mission to the deaf and dumb is at work in any of the following Counties of England:—Cheshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Rutland, Warwickshire (outside Birmingham), Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Bedfordshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, Essex, Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, Berkshire (outside Reading), Middlesex (outside London), Kent, East Surrey, Sussex, Dorsetshire, Wiltshire, Somersetshire (except Bath and Bristol), Devonshire, Cornwall.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. MANSFIELD OWEN, Vicar of S. George's, Edgbaston, Birmingham; and Hon. Canon of Worcester.

[*Read by Archdeacon Emery.*]

To those of us who have devoted some of the best energies and best years of our life in promoting the spiritual and temporal welfare of the deaf and dumb, it is a matter of very real gratification that the committee of the Norwich Church Congress have "thought good to order" that one of the subjects for discussion should be the "Church's Care of the Deaf and Dumb."

It is the proud and very natural boast of Churchmen that there are no needs of humanity which cannot in some degree be met by the Church. This is true of that afflicted class whose highest interests we have this afternoon met together to promote. The Bishop of Barrow has opened the subject in a very able and comprehensive paper, and there will follow me an old friend and fellow worker—one to whom the whole American Church owes a debt of gratitude for the life-long zeal and devotion which he has shown in his splendid and successful efforts to extend the ministrations of the Church to our afflicted fellow creatures across the water. I am sure the Congress gives a sympathetic and hearty welcome to Dr. Gallaudet, whose name is a household

word among the deaf and dumb in the United States. He will tell you how complete and well organized is the "Church's care" of the deaf mutes in America, and you will be forced to the conclusion that in this respect the Church of which Dr. Gallaudet is the representative has far outstripped the Mother Church at home.

It is, however, my pleasing privilege to assure the Congress that during the last ten years the Church, in many localities, has taken up the work with vigour and determination. I might almost say we have gone on "by leaps and bounds." In the year 1885 I had the privilege of pleading the cause before the Church Congress at Portsmouth, under the subject of "Evangelizing Agencies Supplementary to the Parochial System." That year our movement had received a considerable impetus from the fact that the saintly scholar and tender-hearted prelate who at that time filled the See of Winchester (Dr. Harold Browne), ordained a deaf and dumb man deacon (Mr. Pearce), the only deaf and dumb man ever admitted into Holy Orders in the Church of England, although, as Dr. Gallaudet will tell you, there have been several so admitted into the Episcopal Church of America, and at the present time there are five such in Priests' Orders. If hearing and speaking men with the necessary qualification and personal fitness and character could be found, I would rather see these ordained to the special work than deaf mutes themselves, although I personally know of four deaf and dumb at the present time whom I should be very pleased to see admitted to the diaconate, and probably there are others equally qualified.

For some years there have been missions to the deaf and dumb in various parts of England, but the work (to their honour be it said) has been largely carried on by Nonconformists. Ten years ago there were probably only two, or at the most three, dioceses where there were Church Missions to the Deaf and Dumb; now, besides London, Durham and Winchester, Carlisle, Lichfield, Lincoln, Liverpool, and Newcastle have their missions for these afflicted classes, while Norwich and Truro, and, I believe, other dioceses, are taking steps to establish similar missions. Is it too much to hope that this Congress will put the finishing stroke upon the movement in this diocese?

I know it may be felt in some quarters that with all the numerous organizations at work in every diocese, and with the great and increasing difficulty of maintaining those already existing, it is really impossible to start any more with any likelihood of success. Let me say by way of encouragement, that in the Diocese of Winchester (and I single out this mission merely because I have been practically responsible for it from the beginning), not only have we never had any difficulty in raising the necessary funds, about £220 per annum, but it is one of the few, the *very* few, diocesan organizations which shows a balance in hand every year.

If there are any among you who feel inclined to move in the establishment of a mission, and are not quite certain how to set about it, let me tell you very briefly what we did, and what we do, in the Winchester Diocese. We sent a paper of questions to every beneficed clergyman (inclosing a stamped directed envelope, a very necessary precaution, by the way), asking for the names, ages, and addresses of any deaf and dumb resident in their parishes, and also if Mr. Pearce or myself might visit such cases. We tabulated the returns and made out a scheme at once. For the first five years, or rather more, Mr. Pearce worked under me as a licensed lay reader, and therefore he passed through a lengthened and practical training previous to his being admitted to the diaconate. We have prepared and presented 78 candidates for Confirmation, and I myself always interpret the Bishop's addresses to them in the sign and manual language. Southampton and Portsmouth being the largest centres, Mr. Pearce holds services there on alternate Sundays, and goes to other parts of the diocese on week-days, and visits the deaf in their own homes. We have just built a

beautiful little mission church at Southampton for the sole use of the deaf and dumb, and we are now going to build a club-room, so that they may meet together for social intercourse—a most important provision when you consider how isolated many of them are.

This, then, is a very brief sketch of our work, and I hope and pray that the time will soon come when every diocese in England will have a Church Mission to the Deaf and Dumb. I cannot, for the life of me, understand why there should be any hesitation on the point. Ask Canon Jacob what he would have done had not such a mission been at work in his great parish of Portsea? Ask the clergy of London (on both sides of the Thames) what they would do if it were not for our "Royal Association in Aid of the Deaf and Dumb," which covers the whole diocese of London and part of Rochester?

I believe the subject has only to be brought clearly before the parochial clergy of England to receive their hearty support, because, as the bishop has reminded you, they labour under a great difficulty as regards the deaf and dumb. They are their own people, residing in their own parishes, and yet entirely beyond their reach for effective religious instruction. With a single exception here and there, the parochial clergy are utterly unable to teach them, or minister to their spiritual wants, or bring them words of consolation.

Our Church acknowledges the obligation of the command of her Divine Founder to "preach the Gospel to every creature," and nobly has she endeavoured to fulfil her mission by carrying the light of Gospel truth to the "dark places of the earth," whether in foreign lands or in the great centres of population at home.

According to the last census (1891) there are in England and Wales upwards of 9,000 deaf and dumb persons above the age of sixteen years, which, according to the new Act, is the limit of school age recognized by the Education Department. Surely these have as great a claim upon the Church as the heathen abroad!

And here let me say how much we need a Church Training College for those who wish to become missionaries to the deaf and dumb. I think we could well establish such a college in connexion with S. Saviour's, Oxford Street, if some kind friend would supply us with the money.

We are not now considering the *educational* aspect of the question, and therefore I will not refer at any length to the thorny subject of rival methods of instruction. I am strongly in favour of opening up every possible avenue to the minds and intelligences and hearts of these our afflicted fellow creatures. By all means let them be taught articulation and lip-reading where there is any hope of attaining proficiency, but it is my firm conviction that the deaf will never be able to understand a sermon from the lips, or take an appreciable part in a service conducted orally. My belief is that only a small minority of those taught on the pure oral method can really rely upon speech and lip-reading after leaving school. Dr. Stainer has himself said, "Deaf mutes never employ it among themselves, and it is not everybody who can move his lips sufficiently plainly to be comprehensible," and Mr. Duport, one of H. M. Inspectors, is of opinion that "the two systems should supplement each other, and oral training should in no wise despise sign helps."

As one who has been familiar with the sign and manual language from earliest childhood, and having been all my life brought into contact with deaf and dumb people, I most earnestly hope that no attempt will be made to depreciate or decry this means—I believe the *most effectual* means—of preaching the Gospel to the deaf.

"By the arch no bigger than a hand,
Truth travels over to the silent land."

I could say a great deal more on this subject, but my time is up, and therefore I will conclude by saying that while we are making every effort to evangelize the masses, and bring those who are awakened to participate in the privileges of the Church, we are bound, inasmuch as we are blessed with the faculties of hearing and speech, to make special provision adapted to the circumstances of our less favoured fellow creatures, that they, too, may have their full share of the means of grace, and be consoled in their affliction by the comforting assurance that in His own good time God will bring them to that "better land" where "the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing."

Dr. GALLAUDET, Rector of S. Ann's, New York, U.S.; and General Manager of the Church Mission to Deaf Mutes.

I HAVE long had an earnest wish to attend a Congress of the English Church: and my wish has been more than gratified, because I am here, not only as a visitor, but as the representative of the American Church, with the privilege of saying a few words upon the great matter of the care of the deaf and dumb. I shall content myself with making a little statement, because we have not time for stating the reasons for the conclusions at which we have arrived, and I have come to certain conclusions which I desire to mention. My father established the first school for the deaf and dumb in America in 1817, and I grew up with the deaf and dumb. My mother was one of my father's first pupils, and as she was bright and intelligent, she won his heart, and became his wife. I grew up manipulating language with my dear mother, understanding her as well as my father, with whom I often conversed in the same way. I was very fond of my mother, but I made up my mind that I would not marry a deaf mute; but my wife very soon converted me. I went to an institution for the deaf and dumb, and found there a young girl about eighteen years of age, and that settled the business, and she became my wife. In August last we celebrated our golden wedding, and in all these years she has never spoken a cross word to me. I have, therefore, all my life been connected with the deaf and dumb. I established a Bible class for them, and the S. Anne's Institution in New York, at which services are held by signs.

In 1872 we had incorporated in New York a mission to deaf mutes, and, as general manager of that society, it has been my privilege to explain the work in various places in all parts of our country. The Church Mission to Deaf Mutes, being an incorporated society, has established a home for aged and infirm deaf mutes on a beautiful farm near Albany. There we have established a home for those who have broken down in life's journey. Three of the occupants are deaf and dumb and blind, several have imperfect sight, some are crippled, and several are quite aged, and we do everything to make them comfortable. In connection with this society there has been an immense amount of ministration to the deaf and dumb, and those engaged in this service, in various ways, have shown to deaf and dumb people that the Church of Christ means a Church to them as well as to other persons.

I have a few opinions which I must make known as to the care and education of the deaf and dumb; and, although I respect our brethren who hold out the pure oral methods, my experience is, that they do not fulfil the expectations that exist in regard to them. Very few of the pupils are able to hold conversations; and, although I believe in trying all deaf mute children to see what they can do, I do not think that this system can be generally adopted. I myself believe that the greatest good of the greatest number will be accomplished by bringing the two systems, the lip and the manual, together, in what we call in America the combined

system. Some say that signs constitute a drawback in regard to teaching the other method; but we do not find that the case in America. In some cases teachers make a rule that the pupils are not to make signs in the playground, in the school, and dining-rooms, but they will, in spite of such regulations, make signs; because signs are to them what language is to us, and they understand them, just as we hear and appreciate the tones of the voice.

I have a service for the deaf and dumb, and when I begin to preach to them I forget all consciousness of the English language. I speak to them by signs; and I say it with all kindness to my oral friends, that the deaf must communicate with the outer world better by reading, and writing, and signing than by means of things which they do not understand. Let our deaf and mute children grow up using the sign language, and then they will grow up prepared for these improvements. They do not, however, get any advantage from improvements unless they understand the sign language, which gives full play for the faculties with which God has endowed them. If we can give them a little chapel and a little club room, and draw them together out of the temptations of humanity, then we shall accomplish for them a very great deal, more especially if we visit them in their homes, and show them that we believe in the care of the deaf and dumb as well as in the care of speaking people. The Church, indeed, will commit a sin if it does not, under the methods which have been so well pointed out, have diocesan missions, and if it does not press right on, and give help to these deaf and dumb children, and ask them to gather in the Church of Christ, as our blessed Lord did. It is a great comfort to us to feel that we have a special miracle recorded in the Gospels to help us as we try to work among the deaf and dumb, and I hope you will do something to make these people believe that they are encouraged to come to Christ. I hope there will go forth such an influence among the deaf and dumb that they will be induced to take part in religious worship. In America we have missions all over the country, under the bishops and diocesan authorities, and we have a thousand deaf mute communicants.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. F. W. G. GILBY, Chaplain to the Deaf and Dumb, London.

MY first feeling on standing here is one of utter unworthiness in the presence of those who have laboured so many years on behalf of the deaf and dumb. But I have a very intense personal interest in the deaf and dumb, almost in the same way that Dr. Gallaudet has, because my own dear parents are deaf and dumb, and from them I have learned that language by means of which I can myself easily communicate with the deaf and dumb, and by which language I can preach the Gospel to them in London. An association exists for their benefit in Oxford Street, and no matter on what system adults have been educated, oral or manual, we are willing to try and find work for them, and willing to try and teach them. But we do not try to get them to come to our services, if they are orally instructed, against their will, or against the will of their friends. The title of this discussion is very encouraging to me, because we get terribly depressed by accounts which come to us from all parts of the United Kingdom of animosity to our Church work, till one really begins to think that there is no hope of anything being done. But when on a day like this one sees hundreds of people all desirous that work among the deaf and dumb should proceed upon Church lines, it is immensely encouraging. I believe that last year, at a conference at Blackburn, I was the first one to broach the idea of a college for training missionaries for the deaf and dumb, and I think that we could in London give a training to three or four young men; and, at the same time, we should be able to give them a practical insight into the working of a mission, and send them out among the deaf and dumb in London. But these things cannot be done in a day. We have a

petition which has been sent to our own association in London, and it has been formally "laid upon the table," whatever that expression may mean. It may mean that it is overruled for years; but the idea is working in people's minds, and I hope the people who have come here to-day will turn it over in their own minds and write to their bishops about it, and try and get them to move our association in London, so as to arrange for this college.

B. St. John Ackers, Esq., Member of the late Royal Commission on the Blind, Deaf, etc.

As the father of a deaf mute, I wish to express my disagreement with a good deal that has been said to-day. I have a child that communicates by means of speech; but I do not to-day intend to give you my own personal experience, but rather to quote to you the experience of certain persons who are better able to judge than myself, and whose language is far better than any I could give to you. But first of all, may I say this, that those who differ from the manual teachers welcome very much the kindly way in which the Bishop of Barrow introduced this subject. He said that it was perhaps the best to have the dual system if it could be adopted. Allow me to say this: I was first interested in this subject on account of my child becoming deaf at the age of three months; and I am afraid that there are very few who are interested in the deaf in this country, unless they have some such personal interest in the matter. I became deeply interested, and fell in cordially with the views which have been advocated to-day; and I was one of those who warmly supported the mission to the adult deaf and dumb and the church in Oxford Street. Since then things have changed. The Bishop of Barrow said that a great many in this diocese could not understand then the sign system, because their education had been non-existent. That was the case of a large majority in this country. Now, he says that the large majority understand the sign system, and do not understand speech. I hope the time will come when, twenty years hence, we shall look back with great pleasure to what has been done to-day, and we shall not have to have special missions for the deaf, because they will be absorbed in the general population. There is nothing more sad than for a parish clergyman to be unable to communicate with one of his parishioners because he does not understand the deaf and dumb language. I heard a clergymen saying that attending on the death-bed of two deaf and dumb persons was the saddest experience he had ever had. He had no means of communicating with those members of his flock; but if we had the pure oral system established thoughout the land, all this kind of thing would cease. Let me read these few notes. What does the Royal Commission say? "That the deaf and dumb should be kept, as far as possible, from being a class apart. We think that the mixture of the sexes in school, and especially in after life, is, in all cases, unadvisable. We also think that the intermarriage of the congenital deaf should be strongly discouraged, as well as the intermarriage of blood relations, especially where any hereditary tendency to deaf mutism prevails in the family." Again, Dr. Graham Bell, the inventor of the telephone, in his "Memoir upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race," said: "The most promising method of lessening the evil appears to lie in the adoption of preventive measures. In our search for such measures we should be guided by the following principle: (1) Determine the causes that promote intermarriages among the deaf and dumb; and (2) remove them. The immediate cause is undoubtedly the preference that adult deaf mutes exhibit for the companionship of deaf mutes rather than that of hearing persons. Among the causes that contribute to bring about this preference we may note: (1) segregation for the purposes of education; and (2) the use, as a means of communication, of a language which is different from that of the people. These, then, are two of the points that should be avoided in the adoption of preventive measures. Nearly all the other causes I have investigated are ultimately referable to these. Segregation really lies at the root of the whole matter; for from this the other causes have themselves been evolved by the operation of the natural law of adaptation to the environment. We commence our efforts on behalf of the deaf mute by changing his social environment. The tendency is, then, towards accommodation to the new conditions. In process of time the adaptation becomes complete; and when, at last, we restore him to the world as an adult, he finds that the social conditions to which he has become accustomed do not exist outside of his school-life. His efforts are then directed to the restoration of these conditions, with the result of inter-marriage,

and a tendency to the formation of a deaf mute community." Then Dr. Symes Thompson, in his inaugural lecture to the Union of Teachers of the Deaf on the pure oral system, said: "Whilst games of combination are good, and association in effort all that can be desired in school education, the association of the adult deaf and dumb for recreation or intercourse cannot be regarded in the same light." A review of the first annual report of the Carlisle Diocesan Mission to the Deaf and Dumb, which has been lately issued, suggests some quite other conclusions than those it is intended to invite. It reports seventy-four religious services and fourteen lectures delivered in the seven months it covers, and registers tea parties and picnics as organized with the most kindly purpose for those whom this mission is meant to benefit. I hope it will not seem churlish or cynical to hint that from some of those well-intentioned efforts, those who have well considered the condition of this class cannot derive any honest satisfaction. These gatherings are meant to draw the deaf and dumb together, and teach the men and women thus afflicted to find sympathy and pleasure in each others' society. Surely this is the very last thing an enlightened philanthropy would desire. Who can wonder if, from a friendship thus fostered, marriages between those thus brought into contact should be formed? And this, while the responsibility of promoting such unions is, by an absolutely sure and ascertained law, linked with a result as disastrous for the community as the propagation of a race of deaf mutes. The right and truly philanthropic policy is to refuse to recognize those for whom this mission exist as being, in any true sense, a class apart; but by oral teaching and frank home-intercourse to cancel this disability, and absorb them, as soon as possible, into the general body of their hearing and speaking fellows. This is no Utopian dream. It can be done. It has been done; and in proportion as the "German" system is perfected and prevails, it will be done more widely and more thoroughly. In one of Addison's papers in the *Spectator*, we have a droll description of a maladroit humorist inviting a dinner party of stammerers, that he might amuse himself with the abortive irritation which their mutual juxtaposition was sure to excite, and derive a cruel enjoyment from their vain efforts to express it. Between this graceless joke, and the absolutely kindly purpose of the Carlisle scheme, there is of course the most perfect contrast of motive possible. The result of the two experiments has, however, this in common—by drawing men and women together on the basis of a common infirmity, it emphasizes a painful accident, which it is the part of true charity to minimize, and as far as possible to ignore. *Our* charity, though, would aim at something beyond this. We would not minimize or ignore it, but we would correct and repair it as fast as possible. My esteemed friend, the late Dr. Armitage, whose beneficial work for the blind is so universally acknowledged, had the strongest possible objection to the association of blind persons, whether for religious or social purposes. So opposed was he to such gatherings of the adult blind that he refused to allow in his special societies meetings of blind men and women on any occasion. They always met, if at all, men on one occasion, and women on another. If he, an experienced physician, who spent his life and wealth for the blind, was so impressed with the disadvantages of their intermarriage, although children are hardly ever born blind, how much more important is it to prevent friendships between adult deaf men and women, whose marriage, where the parties are congenitally deaf, is sure largely to increase the number of those born deaf. It is sad when missions for the adult deaf and dumb confine themselves to those taught on the silent system. Still more evil is done by these associations inducing orally taught deaf persons to meet with others not so taught. Great influence and attractions are brought to bear to get hold of orally taught pupils, both in the holidays and after they leave school. It is greatly to be regretted that such missions, if encouraged, should not be carried out on the lines suggested by Dr. Armitage, and that deaf men and women be not brought together for social and religious gatherings. It is for the medical profession to speak clearly, emphatically, and with authority on the evils often resulting from the marriage of congenitally deaf persons, and thus to impress the clergy and would-be philanthropists with the danger.

PAPER.

(2) Waifs and Strays.

E. de M. Rudolf, Esq., Secretary and Founder of the Church of England Waifs and Strays Society.

To obtain an intelligent and reasonable definition of the term "Waifs and Strays," it is well to take the several classes of children for whom the Industrial Schools Act was passed thirty years ago. These include children found begging in the streets, wandering and having no settled place of abode or proper guardianship, orphans and destitute children, children whose parents or surviving parent are undergoing penal servitude, or who frequent the company of thieves; children charged with offences punishable by imprisonment, and those beyond the control of their parents. Under the "Elementary Education Act," children who habitually absent themselves from school, and under the "Industrial Schools Act Amendment Act" those living with, or frequenting the company of, women living immoral lives, are added to those mentioned in the original Act. Thus we get a definition of the term "waifs and strays" as understood by the State, and which we cannot do wrong in accepting.

By the operation of the Industrial Schools Act, the State, with the assistance of public bodies, such as county and borough authorities and School Boards, and of private benevolence, has done a valuable work in reclaiming waifs and strays and diminishing crime. It is right to emphasize the fact that the State has not carried out the work without such co-operation, for large sums have been expended in establishing industrial schools which have been derived from other sources, and a not inconsiderable part of the annual cost of maintenance has to be provided in addition to the State grant. In this way all can share in this most important work of caring for waifs and strays as carried out by the machinery provided by the Legislature.

The marvellous success which has attended the action of the State in this matter is its fullest justification. From the report of H.M. Inspector of Industrial Schools recently issued, we learn that there were 18,923 children under the care of the State on the 31st of December last, and that of those who have left the schools during the last three years no less than eighty-five per cent. are doing well. This will give some idea of the good resulting from the passing of the Industrial Schools Act, for if these children had not been protected, the majority would have drifted, without doubt, into the criminal class. This is proved by reference to the Judicial Statistics, where we find a remarkable yearly decrease in the number of criminals, notwithstanding that the population of the country shows a rapid increase. In 1893 the number of adults sent to prison was 148,538, and of juveniles 2,924 as against 156,589 adults and 4,036 juveniles in 1892; and if we take the last ten years and compare 1883 with 1893, we find the diminution still more noticeable. Thus is the work of the State in its success the best argument in favour of the rescue and care of waifs and strays.

Besides, however, the co-operation required by the State, private benevolence has also to deal with the large number of children whom the State cannot reach. There are many reasons why the provisions

of the Industrial Schools Act are not always put into force even in suitable cases. In the first place it is left to the *discretion* of the magistrates to deal with a child under the Act, and in some instances a desire not to interfere with parental rights, or not to over-burden the rates, has prevented them from acting in the best interests of the child. Again, it is difficult, in most cases, to induce those interested to take the trouble of obtaining the necessary evidence on which the magistrates can issue a warrant. Then there is the fact that many people cannot understand the difference between reformatories and industrial schools, and it is thought that by sending children to the latter they are branding them as juvenile criminals; whereas the former institutions are specially intended for this class, whilst industrial schools are for those whom it is desired to prevent from drifting into crime; and there is a very natural objection on the part of parish clergymen to incur unpopularity by taking children before the magistrates and depriving parents—unworthy though may be—of their rights over their offspring is another reason. There are, moreover, a large number of children belonging to tramps, gipsies, and the roving population generally, who cannot be reached because of the time required for the collection of evidence, and the preparation of a case for the magistrates. The latter difficulty might be overcome if the police were authorized to at once take charge of any child *apparently* belonging to one of the classes specified in the Act, pending the necessary enquiries. Parents of the tramp class hardly ever sleep in the same lodging house or casual ward for two nights together, and it is thus next to impossible to deal with their children under the Act, if enquiries have to be made and evidence obtained before proceedings are taken.

As no Government grant is received in respect of children under the age of six years, private benevolence has to deal with them, and also with those children who are over the limit of age laid down in the Act. For one class, that of children charged with offences punishable by imprisonment, the limit is fixed at the age of twelve, and such children over that age, if convicted, must be sent to prisons or reformatories, and these are at once convicted as juvenile criminals. It does seem as if the Act should be amended in this respect, and the age limit for this description of child raised to at least fourteen. Then for the remaining classes the age limit is fourteen, and it will be readily understood that children between that age and sixteen, who come under the descriptions specified in the Act, require guardianship and training as much as, if not more than, those who are younger. These can, under present circumstances, only be provided for by private benevolence.

Now, to see what the National Church is doing for the care of waifs and strays, it will be well, first, to ascertain which of the industrial schools, of which there are 106 in England and Wales, provide for the religious training of their inmates in the faith and principles of the Church of England. The religious teaching in these schools differs widely. An enquiry has been addressed to the managers of all the schools, excepting those specially intended for Roman Catholic children, containing these questions :—" Does a clergyman of the Church of England act as chaplain? Do the inmates only attend the services of the Church of England? Are the unbaptized baptized on admission? Are the inmates confirmed, if fit, before being placed in service?" The second

question is necessary, as it is the practice in some schools to take the children alternately to services in the parish church and a Nonconformist place of worship. In such cases they cannot be said to receive any definite Church teaching, and will probably leave the school with very confused ideas on the subject of religious belief.

So far as is known, no similar enquiry has ever been undertaken, and there is no certain knowledge, as in the case of Roman Catholic children, of the number of industrial schools where the children are being brought up in the faith of the Church of England. This information will be of use, especially to magistrates when preparing their warrants of committal, as it is now required by the Home Secretary that the religion of each child dealt with should be definitely stated. Formerly the general term "Protestant" was used, but now the religion must be more definitely described, either as "Church of England," or by the name of the sect to which the parents belong, and the child can only be sent to such industrial school where it will receive religious teaching in accordance with the description in the warrant.

The result of the enquiry has not been very satisfactory. Of the 106 schools, twenty-six are specially for Roman Catholic children, and five belong to the Waifs and Strays Society. Replies have been received respecting thirty-eight schools, leaving thirty-seven about which no information has been obtained. In the case of twenty-eight schools, accommodating 4,566 children, the inmates only attend the services of the Church of England; and in many of them there is a properly appointed chaplain of the Church of England. Although it is possible that the reason why no replies have been received from thirty-seven schools is that the questions cannot be answered in the affirmative, it is well to assume that there may be other causes; and I venture, therefore, to add 1,500, making altogether 6,066 children in industrial schools receiving definite Church of England teaching. There are about 3,500 Roman Catholic children, and thus there remain about 9,000 children who either receive Nonconformist or mixed teaching. It is satisfactory to know that the Church of England is taking some part with the State in this important work; but no one will deny that there is need for development. The work done under the Industrial Schools Act is a national one, and surely the National Church should be the foremost to co-operate in carrying it out.

Let us now take, in the second place, the work done by individual members of the National Church, excluding my excellent fellow-worker, Dr. Barnardo, for the obvious reason that he himself will explain with far better knowledge than I possess how he is helping the Church of England in her care of the waifs and strays. To arrive at a correct estimate of the number of children maintained in voluntary homes and orphanages, carried on and supported by members of the Church of England, is next to impossible without addressing an enquiry to every parish clergyman, for there are many small homes founded by ladies and others from their devotion to their Church the existence of which is not known beyond the boundaries of the parishes where they are situated. From the "Church's Year Book" we can, however, obtain some idea, though necessarily an imperfect one, of these homes. From the list of orphanages and homes, we find that 6,500 children are sheltered and maintained by the National Church entirely by private benevolence,

without assistance from the State. Taking the average cost of each child per annum at £15, this work would entail a yearly expenditure of nearly £100,000. But in addition to the orphanages mentioned, there are several carried on by Sisterhoods of the Church, of which no particulars are given. The work of the Girls' Friendly Society, Young Men's Friendly Society, and Church Lads' Brigade, all carried on and supported by members of the Church of England, and therefore a part of her machinery, must not be overlooked, for although these societies do not provide permanent Homes, they afford that protection and care for older children which is so necessary to prevent them from drifting into evil courses. Thus the National Church, apart from the Waifs and Strays Society, is doing a grand work by separate and special efforts for waifs and strays.

And now let us glance at the work being carried on by the Waifs and Strays Society, which I think I am right in describing as the only agency of the National Church as a whole, for providing homes for destitute and cruelly-treated children. I should like to emphasize the expression "as a whole," for this society enjoys not only the patronage of Her Majesty the Queen, but also of the two Archbishops and all the Bishops. It appeals only to members of the Church of England; it has branches in every diocese; its affairs are managed by members of the Church of England only, and it trains *all* the children under its care in the faith of the Church of England. The present Archbishop of Canterbury has recognized this fact in an address delivered nine years ago in S. Paul's Cathedral, when he used these words referring to the society: "This is the whole work of the Church for what is so infinitely sad and sorrowful—lost little ones, lost bodies, lost minds, lost souls."

Before the society was founded, Archbishop Tait was approached, in order to obtain his sanction; for had this not been secured at the outset, it is more than likely that no further action would have been taken. After he had made careful enquiry, he gave his cordial approval, and thus the society became a distinctly Church of England institution. Had there been any other organization at the time which provided homes in which the inmates were trained definitely in the faith of the Church of England, and being applicable generally to the whole of the country, entitled to be considered National, there is every reason to suppose that the society would not have been established. A want had to be filled, and not a rival society formed.

And the fact that the society has been supported by the parochial clergy in so remarkable a manner shows that it met the want. It was seen at once that here was the Church of England agency to which the clergy and their helpers could appeal in the case of a waif and stray child. No longer would it be necessary to refer such a case to the workhouse, or place it in a Home established by some great and good philanthropist, where, however, the child would not receive that religious training to which it had been accustomed. Although the society is yet in its childhood, it was supported last year by 2,128 parishes, by means of offertories, lenten savings, and parochial collections. And nearly all the applications for the admission of children into its homes come through parish clergymen, who thus fill the position of the society's rescue officers. Surely it is a most fitting work for a parish priest to rescue

these little ones, for whom our Master had so tender a regard, and to watch over and train them as His faithful soldiers and servants.

The methods adopted by the society are various, as children of both sexes and all ages have to be provided for. The very little ones are dealt with on the boarding-out system, for they are thus provided with real homes according to the divine institution of the family life, and in many cases they obtain also what most of them have never known, a mother's love. It is not an infrequent occurrence that a foster-parent becomes so attached to a child as to wish to adopt it as her own. The system, however, has to be watched very carefully, and the society's foster-parents are not only supervised by some clergyman or other responsible person in the neighbourhood, but a properly qualified lady doctor is continually paying surprise visits to the cottages, and her reports are duly considered by the Executive Committee. With these safeguards there has been no reason to regret the adoption of the system, the reports, with but very few exceptions, being entirely favourable.

It is not practicable, however, to deal with all children on the boarding-out system. It will be easily understood that a child of ten or twelve years of age, who has spent its young life in the slums of one of our large cities, surrounded by all manner of wickedness, could not well be placed with a country cottager. Such a child would probably cause its foster-parents much anxiety, and contaminate the village children. Thus the necessity arises for the small homes, which form the second branch of the society's work. These are scattered over all parts of England and Wales, under properly trained masters and matrons. They are not too large to prevent each child from receiving that individual care and training which is so necessary if its character and disposition are to be properly developed, nor to prevent the inmates from looking on those placed over them as their parents. The incumbent of the parish in which the home is situated is usually the hon. chaplain, and the children attend the National School. Each home is managed under the Executive by a local committee of Church people, of which the hon. chaplain is chairman.

Then there are other homes of a special character for those who have passed school age, where suitable training is given to fit the inmates for earning their living after leaving the society's care. Most of the girls are trained for domestic service, and several of the homes have laundries attached to them, by which means the inmates are qualified to become laundry maids, earning good wages. For the elder boys there are farm homes, where they are trained in agriculture, and fitted for colonial life, and at one home a large printing industry is carried on. At the S. Nicholas' Home for crippled children, and the S. Chad's Home for invalid girls, those who are prevented by physical defects from being trained for ordinary occupations are cared for. The former is really the children's branch of the society's work, as it is supported by the offerings of children in all parts of the country, who are banded together in what is known as the Children's Union.

The emigration branch of the society's work is still in the experimental stage, and the children who have been sent to Canada are chiefly those whom it is desirable to remove to a distance from their former evil surroundings. Some children have also been emigrated at the request of Boards of Guardians On the whole, this branch has been

very successful, nearly all of those sent from England having done well, and it is hoped to further develop this branch.

One distinguishing feature of the Society is that it is always ready to co-operate with existing agencies. Some of its homes are certified as industrial schools, to which magistrates can send children under the Act, and others are certified by the Local Government Board for the reception of pauper children, whom it is desirable to dissociate from pauper surroundings. The society also provides for many little ones rescued by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

Thus is the National Church working in her corporate capacity by means of the Waifs and Strays Society, under whose care there are at present 2,250 little ones. This number will no doubt be added to as time goes on, as each year has shown an increase hitherto, and there are signs on every hand that the work of the Church in this important department of home mission work is being more and more recognized.

The total approximate number of children under the care of the Church, excluding those in Dr. Barnardo's Homes, about whom you will hear presently, is therefore 14,816, made up as follows: 6,066 in certified industrial schools under Church teaching, not including the schools belonging to the Waifs and Strays Society; 6,500 in voluntary homes and orphanages, carried on by sisterhoods and individuals, and 2,250 under the care of the Waifs and Strays Society. The yearly amount raised for the support of the children, taking into account the annual contribution by the State in respect of industrial schools, may be stated at £156,000. This, therefore, is a work of which the National Church may justly feel proud, but no one present will venture to say that enough has been done. When we look at the remarkable result of the working of the Industrial Schools Act, to which allusion has already been made, in the steady diminution of crime, surely it will suggest itself to every-one present that the National Church should work all the harder for the care of waifs and strays; for it is by such efforts that a sure and certain purification of the community can be effected.

ADDRESS.

(READ BY ARCHDEACON SINCLAIR, who said, I am very glad that I am called upon to read this paper, as I am a member of the Waifs and Strays Committee, as well as one of the Vice-presidents of Dr. Barnardo's Homes, and am a strong supporter of every movement set on foot for the rescue of the children. Besides, Dr. Barnardo is an exemplary worker in my Archdeaconry.)

Dr. T. J. BARNARDO, F.R.C.S., Ed., Founder and Director of Dr. Barnardo's Homes.

IT is difficult, if not impossible, to condense the conclusions and experiences of a life-time into twenty minutes; and yet, in dealing with the subject before us for to-night's discussion, "The Church's Care of Waifs and Strays," my chief claim to speak arises from the direction of my life's work.

I take it that we are all agreed that the Church's *care* for the children should be co-extensive with the Church's *duties* towards the Children; and it is only a step further to add that the Church will never be inclined to minimize her duties so long as she remembers Who it was that took up a child, and set it in the midst of His disciples—the type and exemplar for all time to His followers.

So we come at once upon the first and most obvious enquiry, "What are the *needs* of the case?"

I shall not venture into statistics. Enough for me that the range and area of *neglect* are far wider than are all our joint efforts at rescue and prevention. In every part of the United Kingdom the population is increasing by leaps and bounds: everywhere do we note the tendency of rural populations to become urban. Hence, increasing congestion in towns and cities, where the struggle for existence grows fiercer every year, and where the weakest go to the wall, or in the fight are trodden under foot. Enlarging numbers of the poor or labouring classes are, therefore, being pressed continually nearer and nearer to the very margin of destitution, and among these many are falling over the brink into the hopeless state of the homeless, and thence too often into the dangerous ranks of the criminal and vicious.

In speaking of the absolutely destitute, let us bear in mind that we have to deal with *two classes*. In the *first* we find the unfortunate poor, the decent and would-be industrious: and in the *second* the utterly ne'er-do-wells. Great numbers of the poor always live on the margin of destitution, those who, although decent and industrious, can obtain but occasional employment. From time to time great crises occur which precipitate these decent folk into the slough of homelessness and actual destitution, from which few ever again emerge; for when turned adrift from home by family misfortune, by trade vicissitude or otherwise, and sent to herd with the lowest stratum, they soon become demoralized, and a few short weeks of street and lodging-house life are often enough to practically obliterate all traces of their original self-respect and moral superiority.

In the *second* class are the ne'er-do-wells: those who are neither decent nor industrious, who are at best physical and moral weaklings, and at worst vicious, intemperate, confirmed paupers, and in many cases deliberately criminal.

Where shall we find both classes alike, if we seek for them?

In the common lodging-houses, in the tramps' kitchens throughout our towns and cities, in the casual wards, or finally in any chance street shelter!

Such are the common goals upon which both classes converge.

Here, then, among these two classes of the destitute are those with whom we are dealing to-day; for it is upon their unfortunate offspring that the heaviest burdens and the severest penalties fall. Such children always exist in the shadows of Darkest England. Some from their very birth have lived in a hopeless environment; nay, before even they entered the world they were bound with the iron chains of hereditary tendency which all press downward, and that continually. For many of these, their worst enemies are found in the father or mother who degrade them by vile example, and sometimes by deliberate education in vice. That divers adverse influences are constantly at work to destroy what little prospect these poor children, thus launched upon the sea of life, would have of weathering the gales of unprotected infancy, and of reaching the harbour of honest industry and future respectability, cannot be denied by those who have examined, however cursorily, the phenomena of life among the lower strata of the poor. Gaunt hunger, piercing cold, a bitter sense of loneliness, hopelessness, and oppression, combined with the ever-present example set by older associates of unrestrained profligacy, and the prompting of natural inclination to relieve pressing wants at the expense of such qualms of conscience as may survive amid the general wreck—all these influences and many more unite to ruin beyond hope of repair myriads of young lives that might else have become as well-watered gardens, fragrant with blossom, and beauteous with flower and fruit.

I claim in all modesty some knowledge of this subject. For nearly thirty years I have, personally and by means of skilled agents, explored the lowest depths of slumdom, under the deep conviction, of which I never had a doubt, that I was called and sent

by the Divine Voice to rescue children from the perils and degradation of the slums. Whole nights have been spent in common lodging-houses, pacing the streets, examining the "furnished rooms" (as they are called) in the lodging-house districts; and that not in London alone, but in most of the great cities in the Kingdom, with the result that nearly 28,000 children have during that time been lifted out of their old environments, placed under new conditions and under Christian training, and for the most part sent out subsequently into life well-equipped to earn their bread. Of these, 8,000 have been emigrated to the Colonies, where the failures have been less than 1 per cent., and the successes a little over 99 per cent. of the whole.

These are *our* children, the children of the State, but far more the children of the Church. They are Christ's heritage and ours; the general command, "Feed My lambs" being, I hold, as comprehensive as a Christian's ability to seek the lost. Such work *carries with it its own reward*—both as regards this world and the next. Those who undertake it right manfully shall not labour in vain, and, therefore, whether viewed from the spiritual and moral, or only from the temporal point of view, it is alike the duty and the privilege of Christ's Church to thrust in her sickle, and reap a rich harvest in our streets from among those literally "ready to perish." The Church is bound to stretch out loving arms towards the myriads of boys and girls who vegetate in the courts and alleys, beneath dark arches, in the common lodging-houses, by the water-side, the market-places, and other haunts of the destitute poor—children who have "never had a chance," and who at best sustain but a miserable existence by methods which are a reproach to our humanity. I affirm that it is upon the Church of Christ that these poor waifs have the strongest claims, and that for the following among many other reasons:—

I.—These children are *at our doors*. They are *English* little ones; they are not in distant China, in darkest Africa, or in far-away India. Every English town and city can show them. They live and die within the shadow of our churches, within the sound of the bells that summon us to the worship of God. They are not in London alone, but in cities like Liverpool, Glasgow, Newcastle, Leeds, Manchester; and they breathe from the earliest moment only an atmosphere of moral malaria, which is inimical, if not fatal, to decency, to virtue, and to religion.

II.—But, thank God, being at our doors, they can be rescued *at very small cost*, and thus we are aided in doing our duty. A child rescued from the slums, and boarded out, can be maintained for, at the outside, £14 per annum. Take an average of four years for training, and the sum works out at £56 for every child rescued from evil surroundings. The cost of a child received into an Institution will probably be £2 or £3 more per annum. Now this question of expense must be compared with the cost of neglect. If we bear in mind the vast sums spent yearly on our police, our judicial and penal systems, our jails, penitentiaries, workhouses, casual wards, and parochial institutions, we shall not be surprised to hear the professional statisticians say that for every neglected youth or maiden who embarks upon a criminal or pauper career the country is taxed at the rate of from £60 to £80 per annum for the whole term of his or her wasted life. Here, indeed, we have the cost of neglect. Contrast these two items—what it costs to *save*, and what it costs to *neglect*; and, surely, on the score of mere economy, the rescue of the Waifs and Strays is the cheaper experiment, and appeals effectively to the ratepayer as well as to the Christian.

III.—It is *easier to save the child* than to repair the ruin of neglected lives. As Miss Ellice Hopkins asks, in her striking metaphor, "Which is the easier—to fence the precipice at the top, or to provide ambulances at the bottom?"—to prevent the ruin of countless lives now in jeopardy, or to leave the top unfenced, and to devote

our energies to forming Red Cross Societies for the maimed and shattered victims who have fallen down the height?

IV.—In the fourth place, I would point out that this rescue of the children of the slums is not only the cheapest and easiest—it is also the *most divinely hopeful* of all modern missions. The child's heart responds to the voice of Christ as the adult nature never can. Save the children from falling; rescue them while young from the slums: bring them under Christian training, Christian education, Christian influence. Let the arms of the Church, energized by the love of Him Who blessed the little ones, be opened wide to rescue, and in gracious, willing welcome. Let her agencies be multiplied, so that they shall meet the needs of the children as they have never yet done; and it needs no prophet to assert that a single generation shall not pass ere we witness the solution of problems which are now the vexation, and almost the despair, of the Christian philanthropist on every side.

I often ask myself who dare sleep while such a harvest invites the ingathering hand? The knowledge that if the ground be left untilled there will be quite as plentiful a harvest, although of another kind, has always filled me with apprehension. This it was which led to the adoption of the resolve, made years ago when my own first Home was founded, *never to reject a really destitute child under any circumstances whatsoever.* Charles Dickens, that close observer of human nature in some of its aspects, was not singular in his views when he wrote of neglected boys:—

"There is not one of these—not one—but sows a harvest mankind MUST reap. From every seed of evil in this boy a field of ruin is grown that shall be gathered in, and garnered up, and sown again in many places of the world, until regions are overspread with wickedness enough to raise the waters of another deluge. Open and unpunished murder in a city's streets would be less guilty in its daily toleration than one such as this."

Let not the Church of England, therefore, or the other Churches of Christ in this land, be behindhand in this great work—a work which these latter days demand of us, and which if *we* are slack, will fall to other, and, it may be, less sympathetic hands. Addressing the Church Congress, I say, the Church of England should have certainly her official Society, patronised by the Queen, and upon whose board sit ecclesiastical dignitaries of high renown. But I go a step further than this. The Church should view with friendly approval and brotherly sympathy those who, although *not* among her OFFICIAL representatives, are nevertheless rescuing the children and bringing them to Christ Himself. The fact that they *are* rescuing the nation's children from vice, misery, and crime, should be the ground upon which the Church of the Nation should approve and aid them. It is now admitted by most thoughtful men that such workers, though not perhaps officially representing the Church of England, are doing honest, godly *Church* work, deeply and intensely Christ-like. Never should the Church of England, as the national Church, ignore or look coldly or jealously upon those who are bringing the lost lambs back to the fold!

Such a mission by the Church to the Children of the Slums, if undertaken, must be Divinely comprehensive. NO REALLY DESTITUTE CHILD SHOULD EVER BE REFUSED upon any pretext whatsoever: her widely-opened arms must be as unlimited in their embrace as is the invitation of Jesus Christ Himself: "Come unto Me, *all* ye that labour and are heavy laden." And for this reason children who are lame, blind, deaf and dumb, diseased, hopelessly incurable, must (if destitute and homeless) be admitted AT ONCE, without the intervention of a *waiting list.* There must be no failure of promptitude in rescue, nor should her aid depend upon the patronage of the rich or great to gain admission for a needy child. But on the golden hinges of Divine love her doors must open widely and freely by day and night to every child-sufferer!

Moreover, the Church should not only welcome those little suppliants who knock at her doors, she should earnestly endeavour also to SEARCH for the Waifs of the Slums, and, in the Spirit of her Lord, go forth "to SEEK and to save that which is lost."

To rescue these children from impending ruin, often patiently searching for them in those demoralizing lairs where in many cases they are compelled to seek shelter; to snatch these Waifs and Strays from older hands already deeply stained with crime or vice; to stand between the as yet uncontaminated orphan girl, the destitute and friendless boy, and the dismal future grimly stretching out before them; to guide with tenderness and prudence these young lives into helpful channels of industry, enlightenment, and virtue; above all, to fill these hearts while young with thoughts of love to Christ, and to store these young minds with sacred truth, constitutes at once the most noble as well as the most needful of modern missions.

To do this work the Church must arise and gird up her loins to the task, cheerfully giving of her substance and of her favour to ALL engaged in this blessed enterprise. Never will she be so like her Lord as when in His Spirit she echoes His sweet words: "Suffer Little Children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. A. DOWNES-SHAW, Central Organizing Secretary Dr. Barnardo's Homes.

THE point which I especially want to bring before you to-day is—What is the duty of the Church towards those children who are in the hands of societies not in full communion with her? That question I have often heard discussed in my work as a deputation secretary when travelling about England; and I must fairly confess that it is generally answered in a way which I do not think the right one. I believe that there is another and a better answer. I am generally told that it is the duty of the Church to leave those children and those societies severely alone. Now I cannot accept that. I believe that the care, protection, education, and assistance of the forlorn, the destitute, and the miserable, naturally falls upon the Church of the nation, and that it is the duty of the National Church to care for all those in distress, wherever they may be found, and under whatever circumstances they may be. I believe that our beloved Church is not simply in her position to enjoy certain emoluments, or a certain social position, but to guide and care for those needing her care; and it is not only her duty, but her privilege and joy, to do this. We know that a large number of the nation's children—and, therefore, the children of the Church—are in the hands of societies which are not in full communion with the Church. What is our duty towards them? May I give you an illustration? My dearly loved child is in the hands of a stranger; I see that the action or conversation of that stranger is perhaps doing my child harm. What is my duty? Ought I to say to that person, "Oh, well, you are not acting as you ought, you are not speaking as I approve; therefore, go your way, take the child, but do not come to me for assistance or sympathy, but just go your own way." Certainly that is not my duty as a parent, and if I act thus, I neglect in a most culpable way the welfare of my child. There are two courses open to me. First of all, I may go and take the child out of that stranger's hands, and say, "I will not allow my child to be with you," or I may go and say, "I am glad you are doing something to assist this child, but you are making a mistake; you are, in my opinion, doing harm; allow me to show you how;" and so, by kind but firm guidance and assistance, enable that stranger to do that which ought to be done. This humble illustration is easily applicable to the case in question. The parent represents the Church of the nation. The child is an outcast, orphan or destitute, therefore it is the Church's child. It is in the hands of a society which is not a Church society. Is the Church to behave as if she had no parental duties towards such children—to say to the individual who has possession of the child, "You do not act as you ought towards my child, therefore go your way; I will have nothing to do with you or the child; do not come to me for sympathy or assistance?" Surely this is not the spirit in which the Church ought to act. She should come forward and say, "You have my cordial sympathy. You are doing Christ's work; but I think you are making a mistake. I

will help you; I will give you my advice and sympathy, if you will walk in the path of integrity and fairness to the child, and educate him in accordance with the teaching of Christ." I think that should be the action of the Church towards those who are doing the noble work of rescuing the nation's children from degradation and misery, even though they may not be in communion with her. I cannot see that the interposition of a third party abrogates the sacred duty of the parent to the child. It may interfere somewhat with his action, but the relationship remains. The State Church has duties towards the children of the State, whatever religious opinions encircle those children. As an agent of Dr. Barnardo's homes, I should like to say a few words about the work done in those homes. Dr. Barnardo much regrets that he is compelled by urgent business to be absent to-day. In drawing up his paper, he felt that he ought not to force his own individual work upon the attention of the Church Congress; and therefore, he, in a very unselfish way, put his own work out of sight, and only dealt with the question in a general way. Owing to Mr. Rudolf's kind allusion to the Church work done by these homes, I tkink that I may, perhaps, refer to the matter; and I cannot do better than relate my own experience. When Dr. Barnardo invited me to join him, I was puzzled by the question—"Am I, as a Churchman, doing right in working with Dr. Barnardo?" I put the question to him, and he told me that a very large proportion of his children—in fact, about half of them—were under Church teaching; the big village of Ilford (holding nearly one thousand girls) having its own chaplain; one thousand five hundred children being boarded out in villages, under the care of the clergy; the home at Southport for incurable cripples having its chaplain; and in several other homes the children being under Church teaching. "Thus," said he, "we are doing a large work for the Church, not only in taking her children, but in training them under the teaching of the clergy; and you may conscientiously work with us, because we try to do Christ's work, and on lines which you, as a clergyman, can approve." This argument, which completely met my scruples, will doubtless be held as sufficient by many who have doubts on this point. In conclusion, I may say how glad we are to have the subject of the waifs and strays represented on this platform. The Church Congress is imitating our Lord in taking "a little child" in her arms, but I venture to hope that next year—and God grant that this question may come up year after year, because it is so important—I hope that next year the Congress will still further imitate the Master, and not only take the child in her arms, but will "set him in the midst," and not at the fag end of the session, when all are more or less tired of papers and speeches, and when many of those interested in the question have been obliged to return to their homes in the various parts of the country.

The Rev. ALFRED HUNT, Clerical Secretary of the Church of England Homes for Waifs and Strays.

SPEAKING in Norwich, one can hardly omit to remember and to direct your attention to one of Norfolk's noblest sons—Bishop Harvey Goodwin, himself a Norfolk man, born at King's Lynn, who founded one of these homes so long ago as 1849. From that home no less than two thousand boys have passed to spheres of activity and usefulness. One of those boys is an exhibitor at the Royal Academy, a boy who, years ago, was a simple youth, unable to do anything for himself. Reference has been made to those who are not of our faith—and may I say that we will take the children of Dissenters and bring them up; but if you give us Church of England money, we shall bring them up as members of the Church of England. Let me tell you the admirable results which follow this work, as one who, for fifteen years, has been interested in these waifs and strays, and during all that time has taken the keenest interest in them. They are found all over England, and we have taken no less than one hundred and seven from this diocese within a very recent period. I will call attention to one aspect of the work of saving these children. At the beginning of this century there were no less than two hundred offences for which men, women, and children might be put to death; but in the present time these have been reduced to two. In 1820 a boy of fifteen was sentenced to death for some trifling offence; while in 1833 a boy of nine was sentenced to death for stealing an article of the value of twopence in the City of London. Thank God that has been done away with; and in this connection may I draw your attention to the report of the Prison Commissioners in 1893, in which they say that young persons are not coming forward to keep up the members of the criminal population. This being their statement, we feel

thankful that such a report should come from such a source. But there is another point which I am also equally thankful to say shows progress and development in our moral life in England. During twenty-five years our population has increased remarkably—by five millions of people—and during that time the prison population has decreased no less than twenty thousand. During the last fifteen years eleven prisons have been closed, which were a cost to the nation of £250,000 a year. Thank God, therefore, for such success as has followed this mission to waifs and strays throughout our island home.

The Rev. J. HOWARD SWINSTEAD, Missionary to Gipsies, Showmen, and Van Dwellers in Salisbury Diocese.

I COME forward on behalf of a certain class which is not often talked about in Congress by Church of England people. There are, as far as I know, only three Church of England clergymen specially set apart for looking after gipsies and van dwellers, and it is commonly understood that they are unworthy of our help and sympathy; that they live in fever dens, and are only fit for prisons. That is not true, and it is partly ignorance which sets people so much against them. The fact is, they have been neglected. Because the Church of England has left them on one side and treated them as outcasts, therefore I come to ask you to give a passing thought to these children. Picturesque as they are, with swarthy faces and dark skins, which seem to indicate they come from the sunny south, there is more than picturesqueness in them. There is much in the children's hearts which is good and loving; and their parents have a pride in them, and care much for those who are kind to their children. I have under my charge in the diocese of Salisbury, two hundred and fifty such little ones. Multiply that number by the dioceses, and you have nearly ten thousand children of van dwellers in the country. They are those who might be first taken up by our loving Saviour and carefully tended if He were now amongst us. It is generally supposed that the teachers and managers of our schools stand, as it were, at their doors and say, "Come in and be taught. Here is our beautiful school building made to meet the Government demands; come and be instructed;" and it is supposed that the showmen's children turn aside and say, "Not for us; we don't like it; we are not coming." I hear on the other hand the parents of these little ones complaining that there is no chance of getting their children educated, and, as I know that they are attacked and accused of lying and cheating on every side, I have taken the liberty of getting high authority for repudiating any such accusation that wherever education is offered to them they are unwilling to accept it. Sir George Kekewich is my authority. I asked him whether any grant could be given for travelling schools such as were held by our mission in Salisbury. The answer was that no grant is possible. I asked him whether travellers have any chance of admission to places in the schools of parishes that they pass through. The answer was, "No claim whatever, unless school places are already in existence which are not filled." When they number thirty or forty children at a fair, how is it possible for a small school (even if it has lately been enlarged to meet Government demands) to welcome them? I asked whether outside teachers might be allowed to enter such schools and use the buildings and the plant, in case holidays have been given for the four days. The answer was, "Unless the managers and the teachers allow it, in no case." And this permission has been refused in some parts. I asked another question. "Supposing the managers or teachers have a suspicion—but no more than a suspicion—of a contagious disease existing in a living-van, and supposing there is no manner of proof to establish this suspicion, can those who apply for school places be refused admission?" And the answer I received is, "Any question of refusing admission on account of the suspicion of infectious disease would have to be treated on its merits." I put it before you as a reasonable question, whether such difficulties may be removed from those who most need education and care. And is it fair to turn round to them and say, "We offer you education, and yet you will not accept it?" We know perfectly well that it is our suspicion of uncleanness, which is often only dim and general, and sometimes impossible to prove, that gives rise to this state of things. I have lived among them, travelling in our diocesan van, for three years, and of the uncleanness which is supposed to be their natural condition, we find less than we used to find. There is a story of a woman who was asked by a missionary why she did not wash herself more often? She had a mahogany complexion; and she replied, "Well, I do wash as often as other people, but I do dry up such a bad colour." If such a question were

addressed to them now, the answer would be more indignant. Other stories might be told and imagined concerning the people with whom we live, but I wish to keep to this one point. I wish you to believe that there is good in them. Their travelling habits make them really polite, and their frequent appearances at fairs make them cultivate good behaviour as a means of livelihood. As their lives are full of trouble and annoyance, so are they the more willing to receive that heritage which it is our privilege to offer them, the welcome to a holy hope, and the service of Him who said, "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in."

The CHAIRMAN.

BEFORE we separate, perhaps you will allow me, as I consider it somewhat as a duty, to make a few remarks. First, in relation to the deaf and dumb. I think you will agree with me that we have had very interesting speeches and papers, and I doubt not that our sympathies in regard to their welfare have been more than ever awakened, since the amount of relief which can be given to our unfortunate brothers and sisters, and the extent to which it may be and should be increased, has been plainly set before us. The hopelessness of the task of remedying these defects of nature was for many centuries universally assumed. In the earliest times, in some countries, it was actually the custom to put to death all children who continued after the age of three years to show that they could neither hear nor speak; and in the fourth century of our era, S. Augustine laid it down that "deafness from birth makes faith impossible, since the persons can neither hear the Word nor read it." It is said that the first recorded case of a deaf and dumb man being taught to speak words and sentences is to be found in the annals of the Venerable Bede. This was in 685. From that period for some eleven centuries, we have only a few recorded cases, which at the time were considered incredible, of similar efforts to teach the dumb to speak; and no systematic effort appears to have been made until the conclusion of the last century. Then the subject was taken up in England, and in 1792 the first institution, called the London Asylum, was established, this being supplanted some fifteen years later by a larger building. In 1862 an important branch of this institution was experimentally conducted at Margate, until some fourteen years later; in 1876 a permanent building for one hundred and fifty children was erected for paid and unpaid cases. In other countries similar movements were established also about the end of the last century. In America especially they went to work upon a large scale, and the establishments of this nature multiplied so quickly that at the last census, twenty years ago, there were no less than thirty-five of them, the first owing its existence in 1817 to the efforts of the father of Dr. Gallaudet, whom we are all so glad to welcome here. In America, and in almost every country in Europe except Great Britain, the State has recognized the duty of educating the deaf and dumb, and supplied the funds by annual grants. Here, in our enlightened country, it is only just two years since an Act was passed making their education compulsory, and throwing a part of the expense upon the parents, who are compelled to contribute according to their means. What was done—and much had been done towards the education and alleviation of the wants of this pitiable class of the community—before that Act was the result of spontaneous efforts and voluntary contributions; and though many institutions were founded and admirably conducted, I fear the want of State assistance left us behind other countries; and yet the problem to be solved, and the duty to be faced, were not of a formidable character. The last census but one, that of 1871, showed that the number of deaf mutes in the country amounted to only one in two thousand of the population. That was the proportion of people so afflicted, and there were at that time under twenty thousand deaf mutes in the country, and that figure showed a decrease from the previous census, demonstrating that the improvement in sanitary conditions, and the increased skill in dealing with some of the causes producing deafness, can materially reduce the number of sufferers. Then there is the additional fact that the same return shows that the number of adult deaf mutes who took refuge in the workhouse was a very small and decreasing number, only five hundred and twenty-nine out of eleven thousand five hundred and eighteen taking that course. This shows that under wise treatment the capabilities of these unfortunate, helpless people to earn their own livings were very much enlarged and increased. I say, then, that the duty of exercising the work of charity, by specially educating some thousands of children between the ages of seven and fourteen years of age, would not be a grievous tax upon the revenue if the task were taken in hand by the Government; nor is it one which draws heavily upon philanthropy if left to voluntary

effort. But the great benefit of the recent Act is that none can by accident, neglect, or choice, now escape the technical education required to remove many of the disabilities under which this class has hitherto laboured. Now that we have established the certainty of a secular education by the assistance of the State, is not this the time of all others for the Church of England to throw herself heart and soul into the spiritual instruction of a class who are cut off from the ordinary services and ministrations of religion? The subject of our first discussion is the Church's care in ameliorating the condition of this class physically, morally, and intellectually; and I do not think those duties can be better summarized than in the seven defined objects set out in the first annual report of the Carlisle Diocesan Mission to the Deaf and Dumb, viz. :—(1) To provide instruction for the deaf and dumb, and to assist the clergy of their own parishes in ministering to them; (2) To search out all the deaf and dumb within the diocese, and keep a register of their condition and circumstances; (3) To visit the sick and others at their homes, and to help them in every practical way; (4) To render assistance in getting deaf and dumb children sent to and admitted into suitable schools; (5) To educate, as far as practicable, the adult deaf and dumb whose education has been neglected; (6) To assist the deaf and dumb in obtaining employment; (7) To provide suitable recreation for the deaf and dumb. What has been done in Cumberland—with its population under three hundred thousand—can surely be accomplished in Norfolk with nearly two hundred thousand more inhabitants. The expenses of their mission are put at about £150 per annum; and even in these bad times I hope that a successful effort can be made to follow the good example of the northern county, and to establish and support a similar mission in Norfolk. I wish to say a few words about waifs and strays, particularly about the two great establishments which deal with them—Dr. Barnardo's Homes, and the Church of England Homes. I do not feel called upon to make any invidious comparison between the two establishments. It is sufficient for me that they co-exist, and as a Churchman I recognize the merits and the claims of each upon me. Dr. Barnardo has worked for twenty-nine years, and his main hope and aim he says is to "extend the kingdom of God among the slums." The Church of England Homes have been established about half that time for the same object, and we owe a deep debt of gratitude to him who set us the example. The claim of Dr. Barnardo, himself a Churchman, is that his Homes are national Protestant institutions, receiving children from all denominations, and providing spiritual ministrations for all according to their creeds. He has lately provided a new and special fund, called "The Church of England Auxiliary Fund," which is to be applied solely to the maintenance of children who are being educated under the influence of the Evangelical clergy. He claims, and it is a noble claim, that his is the only institution in the world which is not content with receiving destitute children into the homes; but which night and day is at work in London and elsewhere endeavouring to find them and to bring them in. The claim of those who established the Church of England Homes is that they have removed the reproach that, unlike those outside her communion, she had no central organization for the rescue and care of destitute children. Dr. Barnardo includes the system of boarding out in the exhaustive list of provisions for the good of those under his care. He has his Baby's Castle in Kent, for children up to five years; his Nursery Home in Jersey, for boys from five to ten years; his Leopold Home, for those from ten to thirteen years old; his Central Home, for those between thirteen and sixteen; and his Labour House, for those of seventeen and over, for a few months before emigration or home employment; and similar establishments for girls, one of which at least is self-supporting. He has also a shipping agency with branches at Cardiff and Yarmouth, mission houses on inter-denominational principles, and evangelical deaconesses' institutes. On his working staff he has eleven clerical deputation secretaries, and five Nonconformist and general deputation secretaries. The Church of England Homes differ from Dr. Barnardo's in one respect, they reject the barrack system and institutional home, and confine their operations to emigration, to separate homes, and to the boarding-out system, under the strict supervision and education of members, male and female, of their own denomination only. It certainly has done noble work during the last fourteen years; and from the statistics furnished there appears to be abundant work for both sets of workers, and, alas! an urgent call for more money, for in both establishments deserving cases have to be declined from want of funds. They can neither stand still—they must go forward and meet the requirements. Dr. Barnardo makes a special appeal for a few ladies "who desire an immediate field of service in the Master's cause to seize the golden opportunity of attending the dispensaries to speak

to the patients while waiting to see the doctor." He makes a further appeal in order to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of his homes, by raising a fund to clear off some old outstanding incumbrances. On the other hand, the Church of England Homes earnestly invite the further co-operation of the clergy and laity, and show that though their general income has increased in the last year, it has not kept pace with the increase of deserving cases; and they plead at this Congress, as elsewhere, for further support from us and other members of the same communion for an organization peculiarly dependent upon us rather than upon the general public. To those appeals I for one say "Yes," and I ask you to say "ditto," and to suit the action to the word.

AGRICULTURAL HALL,

FRIDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 11TH, 1895.

R. T. GURDON, Esq., in the chair.

WORKING-MEN'S MEETING.

(1) POOR LAW ADMINISTRATION.
(2) OLD AGE PENSIONS.
(3) BENEFIT SOCIETIES.

ADDRESSES.

The CHAIRMAN.

I CONGRATULATE the powers that be in having selected for one of their subjects a most important one to the working-man. I think it will be proved that this Church Congress greatly sympathizes with objects of this kind, and I can hardly conceive questions that can more interest the working-man than that of the administration of the Poor Law, Friendly Societies, and Old Age Pensions. They come home to working-men. The first two have been before us for years, and I have spoken both at the Congress and at meetings of various kinds on the last question. The question of Old Age Pensions has been forced to the front very much in the last few years, and even months; and I prophesy, if I may venture to prophesy, that it will come still more to the front in the immediate future. If it had been my lot to have been cast among the working classes, if I had had to depend for existence upon the labour of my hands, I fancy there would have come home to me strongly the necessity of providing for myself and my wife in our old age. I should feel that as the years were growing upon me, as I was getting older and weaker, and younger and stronger men were pushing me on one side, I should like to feel no fear and apprehension of what might happen to me in the future. It is not an easy question. I admit freely that it is a very difficult question. But there are able men in this world; there are men whose business it is to settle difficult questions. What are Cabinet Ministers made for? What are they paid £5,000 a year for, except to settle questions of this kind. I ask them, with a pretty good hope that our wishes may be attended to, that they will take up this important question, and that they will, if possible, bring it to a good issue, so that England may be able to say that we only among the nations of the world have made some provision for our respectable working-men who have served their employers well, and who have served the State well, and that they have something more to look to in their old age than the workhouse and the charity of their neighbours.

The Right Rev. F. J. JAYNE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Chester.

I.—THE subject has, I understand, been chosen by the working-men themselves. If so, it justifies their choice by its deep and complex relation not only to national finance, but to national character. "Our Poor Laws," writes Mr. Fawcett, "have exercised, and are still exercising, such a powerful influence upon the character of

the people as to render any examination into the social state of the country perfectly nugatory which excludes them from the investigation."

Though during the last half century there has been a remarkable reduction in pauperism, from over sixty to about twenty-five in one thousand of the population, the proportion is still great, especially among those of the artisan and labouring classes over sixty-five years of age. Speaking roughly, on any day of the year a huge continental army of 700,000 men, women, and children is receiving poor relief. Of these some 500,000 will be receiving out-door relief. The annual Poor Law Bill, including cost of lunatic paupers and repayment of loans for building, has now reached nearly £9,000,000. We have thus a bird's-eye view of the magnitude of the matter.

For dealing with the subject, I have supplemented my own necessarily limited experience and observation, not merely by reference to standard books, particularly Blue Books—those invaluable storehouses of impartial enquiry and many-sided experience—but have submitted a series of questions on the most crucial points to experienced guardians in different parts of the country, and representing very different kinds of Unions.

II.—At the outset, it is essential to remember that the object of a Poor Law is the relief, not of the poor generally, but of the destitute poor, those in want of necessaries, either through their own fault or their misfortunes—"voluntary or involuntary paupers," as Mr. Fawcett terms them. The object of charity, on the other hand, is to relieve the deserving poor, the victims of misfortune; and the great *desideratum* is that the Poor Law should so work in concert with charity and charitable endowments, and, again, with benefit societies, as to bring the deserving poor under the warmer and softer wing of these latter agencies.

The Black Half-Century of Poor Law History.—There is a period in the history of English pauperism which should never be forgotten, as a warning beacon against all well-meant schemes for widening the scope and relaxing the character of the Poor Law, by extending it to the relief of poverty in general. The period in question covers the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries—it is almost co-extensive with George III.'s reign. During this period the sound principles of the Poor Law of Queen Elizabeth's reign (1601) were fatally set aside. Under Gilbert's and East's Acts, guardians were required to find work for able-bodied paupers near their own homes, and to supplement their wages out of the rates. The workhouse test was abolished. Hence, by 1832, the country was on the verge of moral and financial ruin. This was made startlingly manifest by the report of the Poor Law Commissioners in that year. Between 1783 and 1818, the annual Poor Law expenditure (the population being then about eleven millions) had leaped up from £2,000,000 to £7,000,000. Farmers had sometimes to turn off their best labourers to take on able-bodied paupers for whom the Guardians had to find employment. Near Eastbourne, pauper labour received 16s. per week, the independent labourer 12s. Villagers were all but bankrupt. It was more lucrative for women to have illegitimate than legitimate children. Sons and daughters received presents from the overseers for sitting up at night and looking after their parents. Sometimes a young man and his bride on the day after their wedding would call on the overseers and ask to be put on the relief list. In one place the rector had to employ sixty-two men as well as pay a poor rate of £400. In one parish—Cholesbury, Bucks.—the paupers were offered the whole of the land, but preferred their present position. The officials themselves were demoralized. It is tempting to quote further tit-bits, but time forbids. But the revelations of the report should be kept prominently before the eyes of the working classes, and of all classes in this country, as a danger signal against well-intentioned sentimentalism in the administration of the Poor Law. We are sometimes told that if relief were granted as a right, it would have a different moral influence; but before 1832 people had come to regard Poor Law assistance very much as their right, yet the demoralizing effects were as bad as they well could be.

The Restored Poor Law.—As the result of the Poor Law Commission of 1832, the new Poor Law of 1834, under which we are still living, was passed. This was really a return to the admirable fundamental Poor Law enacted by sagacious statesmen at the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign. My authorities are of opinion that very little in the way of new legislation is required. They are agreed that the existing powers, well administered, and with intelligent co-operation between the Board of Guardians and the Local Government Board, are

ample. Such amendments as they suggest are these:—(*a*) The consolidation and simplification of our existing laws and orders of the Local Government Board; (*b*) certain alterations in the law of settlement and removal; (*c*) an experienced lady guardian desires that fuller control should be given over the unhappy women, often of weak intellect, who come again and again to the workhouse to be delivered of illegitimate children; (*d*) others think that the incidence of the poor rate falling, as it has done since 1840, on one class of property only—houses and land—presses most unreasonably and inequitably on landowners, clergy, and farmers, and calls imperatively for readjustment. But, in the main, administration, not legislation, is the thing to be kept before our eyes.

III.—*Administration.*—And here let me press upon my audience as emphatically as I can the importance of administration, which means good management, the effective carrying out of existing laws and powers, not only as regards the poor law, but as regards laws in general. The tendency is to think that when a law is passed it will work of itself. There could not be a more dangerous delusion. It is a pardonable exaggeration to say, when comparing laws and systems,

"Whate'er is best administered is best."

Of the Poor Law this is pre-eminently true. Let us, therefore, see who are the administrators, and what good administration means.

The Administrators.—We start with the choice of the guardians. The electors have the great responsibility of choosing the best men and women to be guardians of the poor and of the rates. My authorities are agreed that, as a rule, too little interest is shown in the election of guardians, and that the interest is mainly of a political character. Next, the guardians, when elected, have the appointment of the officers of the Union, the chaplain, the medical officers, often too few and underpaid, the nurses, the master—an all-important official—and his subordinates, the relieving officers. The guardians supply from their own body the Visiting Committee, and can appoint a committee of ladies specially concerned with the female inmates. Here we have a wide and varied field of administrative responsibility, and if the work is to be well done some of the best members of the community should come forward for election. It is noteworthy that the Unions which have produced the best results have often owed this to the leadership of able and diligent individuals among the guardians, who have time to spare and the magnanimity to spend that time on public business. Further, there must be—and, happily, there increasingly is—co-operation between (1) the guardians of different Unions, who now with mutual helpfulness confer on difficult points of administration, and (2) between the guardians of the country at large and the Local Government Board. This central body, which has very great powers, can do much, while avoiding an over-centralised system, to guide and instruct the guardians on the best lines of movement, and to diffuse a clear and steady light over the Unions of the land. Behind and around all these agencies lies public opinion, working through the Press and in a hundred different ways; and an enlightened public opinion, towards which every single individual can and ought to contribute something, is an indispensable condition of effective and progressive administration. From this bird's-eye view of a wide and varied field, it may be understood how much, for better or for worse, depends upon the Poor Law administrators at different posts and of different grades.

Methods of Administration.—But supposing that the administrators are alive to their responsibilities and opportunities, along what lines shall they move? They have to deal, as we have seen, with two great classes—the undeserving and the deserving destitute. To distinguish between them calls for discrimination; and discrimination is an essential note of good administration. It means time and experience and a sufficiently numerous staff to weigh cases carefully in the scales. Overdriven relieving officers, perfunctory Guardians, cannot discriminate properly. At the outset we are confronted by the vexed question of indoor *versus* outdoor relief. A good deal can apparently be said—this at any rate is the conclusion of that laborious investigator, Mr. Charles Booth—for either policy, or for a judicious combination of both. Really good management will make almost any method work well.

Outdoor Relief.—My authorities are on the whole agreed that outdoor relief cannot be wholly dispensed with in cases, *e.g.*, of widows, and of the deserving aged poor, whose physical and moral surroundings are sufficiently wholesome; but they insist that when it is given it should be given adequately, not a mere pittance; and that the cases should be from time to time carefully revised.

Laxly given outdoor relief is admitted to be uneconomical, inhumane, and immoral in its tendencies. Some remarkable instances can be quoted of good results following the refusal of outdoor relief to all new cases; *e.g.*, in the Bradfield Agricultural Union (Berkshire), under the chairmanship of Mr. Bland Garland, who started as a believer in outdoor relief, the following results were obtained in the twenty years between 1871 and 1891 :—Paupers reduced in spite of a growing population from 1,258 to 136; annual expenditure from £11,000 to £2,275; the poor rate from 2s. 4½d. in the pound to 4d. And that this reduction was unaccompanied by hardship may be gathered from the fact that Mr. Garland put aside from his private income £200 a year to meet hard cases. The first year he spent £50; after that there was no demand. In town Unions, *e.g.*, Stepney and Whitechapel, correspondingly good results have followed from a strict indoor policy. On the whole, and admitting that a certain variety of system must be allowed in different districts, it seems tolerably clear that for outdoor relief a high standard of qualification should be required; it should be given only to those of good character, who have shown proof of thrift, and whose surroundings are such as to justify assistance in this shape; and where these qualifications are found the relief should be really adequate. It has been found in not a few instances, that deserving cases of this kind can be transferred from the footing of pauperism to that of pensioners on private or endowed charity. Laxly given, outdoor relief is beyond all question a cruel kindness to those relieved, to those who are influenced by the spectacle of such relief, and to the poor ratepayers who are taxed so heavily to support an unsound system. Let me remind you, in passing, that though poor rates may not be paid directly by the compound householder and others, yet, sooner or later, rates find their way into rent. This is an unrecognized fact upon which the Royal Commission on the aged poor desires that stress should be laid.

Indoor Relief.—Turning to the workhouse itself, to indoor relief, discrimination here takes the shape of classification. Different ages, sexes, states of health, and, as far as possible, characters, should be classified and kept apart. And there might be more combination between Unions for dealing with the aged deserving poor, imbeciles, epileptics, and special cases of this class. The children have to be dealt with separately. It is of the utmost importance that they should be kept from contamination by inmates of the degraded sort; and, further, that they should be kept free from the workhouse taint and association. It is said by experienced Guardians that children who have been brought up in the workhouse easily tend to return thither as to a home. A great improvement has taken place as regards the treatment of children, either by sending them, dressed in ordinary clothes, to the National or Board schools, to mix with other children, or by bringing them up in cottage homes with a school attached, or by boarding them out in respectable labourers' families. But, while rejoicing in such progress as this, we must not lose sight of Mr. Fawcett's warning against making the life of pauper children, in many cases the children of unthrifty, drunken, and immoral parents, better than that of the children of industrious and independent parents, thus putting a premium upon pauperism.

A great advance, again, has been made in the treatment of the sick in workhouse infirmaries and under trained nurses. The pauper nurse, though still too frequent, is rapidly giving way to a worthier representative of humanity and medical skill. Not a few of the aged and infirm poor spend a good deal of their time in the workhouse infirmary, who have a special claim to care and comfort. The weak minded and lunatic have to be dealt with separately, and similar improvements have been made in reference to them. The question of the aged poor is being dealt with by another speaker, but I may just say how much has been done for them in workhouses by the provision of quarters for aged married couples, by the Brabazon system, which relieves the monotony of their lives by useful and pleasant employment, by opportunities of employment in house work, by the formation of workhouse libraries, and, not least, by the building of separate chapels attached to the workhouse, instead of the dingy service in the dinner-smelling hall. Apart from the devotional considerations, the change on Sundays from the common hall to the bright chapel with a bright service is no small relief to the monotony of the pauper's life. And in this connection let me say how important a responsibility lies upon the guardians in the choice of a chaplain. As regards tramps and casuals, the consensus of opinion seems to be that the very large majority of them are mendicants—indolent, drunken, undeserving. The *bona-fide* labourer in search of employment forms an almost infinitesimally small percentage. One per cent. is the estimate of a very experienced guardian. He usually relies upon and is supported by other helpers and agencies. When he can be identified, he should certainly be dealt with as considerately as

possible. In dealing with men of the former class, S. Paul's stern rule must come into play—"If a man will not work, neither shall he eat." He must be made to work under the labour master's eye as a condition of receiving food and shelter; and he must be made, not only to work, but to wash himself and to submit to a very stringent discipline. "Something between a prison and a workhouse is wanted for these gentlemen of leisure," writes one of my informants. Some workhouses, when they come across a really respectable wayfarer, allow him to go out early to seek for work, instead of keeping him in for labour. But the very large majority are wastrels and ne'er-do-wells, a curse to themselves, and a curse to the working classes on whom they prey. The trouble they give is out of all proportion to their number, which seems to be about eighty thousand all told, eight thousand of whom may be found on any ordinary night in the workhouse wards. Conferences between guardians are endeavouring to equalize the treatment of tramps, instead of having laxity here and strictness there. Another crux is the question of the temporarily unemployed Here again the question is confused by the number of impostors who flock together and swell the number of the unemployed when any money is going. Over and over again those who have been in charge of relief work of the kind have been baffled and disheartened by this admixture of the good with the bad. Discrimination reaches a high point of difficulty in such cases. To call upon local bodies to find work for the unemployed may bring us perilously near the state of things under the old Poor Law, unless the most careful precautions are taken to see that the work done is as good and the wages as well earned as for any ordinary employer and contractor. The guardians, it has been suggested, may sift applicants, bringing the workhouse test to bear on "old stagers," but recommending to the local sanitary authorities for wage-earning employment those who can show thrift, sobriety, and industry in their record. The recent report of the Committee of the House of Commons on distress through want of employment, considers that there are already statutory powers under which boards of guardians might set poor people to work for wages, but that such powers cannot be used until rules are made by the Local Government Board. They also recommend that those to whom work is given under conditions of exceptional distress, should not lose their franchise. But they seem to think that further investigation into the whole of this most perplexing subject is desirable. We have rapidly surveyed a wide and difficult tract of country. We have noticed the all-importance of Poor Law administration; its departments and agents; its methods; its burning questions. We have discovered no short cuts or royal road. But we have found much in the way of solid improvement, especially as regards the treatment of children, the sick, and aged deserving poor, and as regards the reduction of pauperism. I hope we shall agree that the fairest prospect of maintained improvement lies in patient continuance on the present lines of strict, though by no means unsympathetic, administration, the different boards of guardians working intelligently hand in hand, not only with one another and with the Local Goverment Board, but also with the various agencies of thrift and charity, all alike being strengthened and quickened by a really enlightened public opinion.

The Rev. H. C. SHUTTLEWORTH, Rector of S. Nicholas Cole-Abbey, E.C.; Professor of Pastoral Theology, King's College, London.

My task to-night is a difficult one. I have to deal with a question which is puzzling all the wisest and most experienced among our statesmen and social reformers—namely, Old Age Pensions, and you will not expect from a working parson a solution of the problem when wiser men have failed. It is worthy of your notice that a Church Congress should consider such questions within the range of its discussions, showing, as it does, that social subjects are of the deepest interest to the Christian Church, more especially when they bear directly on the lives and the happiness of the poor. The fact is, we have come to see that pauperism and destitution are two of the deadliest foes to godliness. You can hardly expect a man to think much about intellectual pursuits, or high spiritual interests, when his whole energies are absorbed in the great question of how he is going to get bread for himself and his children. We ought to recognize quite frankly that poverty and pauperism, and all the evils that follow in their train, are not a mysterious dispensation

of Providence, the stern lot of the majority of the human race, but they are evils which can be cured, and ought to be cured.

Many of you know who it was who first brought this most absorbing question prominently before the public in our own day. It was a parson of the Church of England. I do not mean to say that Canon Blackley was absolutely the first man to raise this question, but he was the first who brought it before this generation. Canon Blackley's scheme of national insurance was the proposal which set men thinking. Although the details of that measure are not in all respects accepted, and although he himself is ready to admit that many of them have been shown to need modification, yet the influence of those proposals may be traced in every scheme that has been set before us since. I remember at the time that Canon Blackley first set forth his scheme, I was at a meeting where the matter was discussed. The opener, a prominent Secularist, commenced his speech with this observation:—"At last, for the first time in my knowledge, an English clergyman has come forward to propose something useful!" That was, of course, only the speaker's fun, or possibly his prejudice; but, at the same time, it showed what an impression the proposal had made on his mind. Now that it is coming well within the scope of practical politics, we ought to remember who it was who brought it forward. "Honour to whom honour is due."

It has been shown, I believe, pretty conclusively, that nearly one in every two of the labouring classes in this country, and one in four of all classes and both sexes who reach the age of sixty-five, die paupers. Just think what that means. It is enough in an assembly of intelligent and thoughtful Englishmen simply to state that appalling fact to show that it is our plain duty to do our utmost to deal with it. I venture to say that these figures are a standing disgrace to a country that calls itself Christian. I cannot for myself find much consolation in the various attempts which are made by certain writers of the extreme individualist school to explain or minimize the force of those figures, or to show that they do not apply. We are perfectly familiar with their methods of explanation. It is urged, for example, that pauperism is deplorable, but it is all the fault of the working classes themselves; they are so idle, so drunken, and so thriftless, that they become poor in their lives and paupers in their old age. The very figures that I quoted to you just now prove that that statement is a lie. I said that one in every two of the labouring classes reaching the age of sixty-five die paupers. Now, if it is their own fault, how does it come about that eight-ninths of that number do not become chargeable to the rates until they are over sixty years of age? Does not that show that it is not their fault, but their old age, which makes them paupers? No man knows better than a working parson how cruel and unjust this accusation is. I know perfectly well, and you know too, my friends, that there are men of the working class who are idle, and drunken, and thriftless; such men must reap as they have sown. But I say that the idle, the drunken, the thriftless, in *every* social grade, ought to reap as they have sown. "He that will not work, neither let him eat," is a true and just sentence, but it should apply all round.

There are black sheep in every fold, and it is no use saying that because men fall into destitution in their old age, it is therefore generally or necessarily their fault. My own experience is that when working-men fall into destitution in their old age, it is not always, or even generally, their own fault. I have seen many cases of men who have gone through great self-denial in order to ensure their own comfort and that of those dear to them in old age, only to see their savings swept away by the failure of some friendly society which was the only means of assurance within their reach; who lost their all because the basis of that friendly society was not sound, or because it was badly administered. No one could say that it was these men's own fault that they had to come upon the poor rate in their old age.

Others urge that our social condition is due to the operation of inexorable laws, which in the end tend to cure the evils they seem to cause; and with which you cannot meddle without doing more harm that good. It is thus, we are told, the world is made. If indeed, it is so, then we must still remember what men like Huxley and Mr. Kidd have told us that there are ethical and spiritual forces which are mightier than these so-called "inexorable laws"; forces by whose means the highest and noblest achievements of human progress have been attained. If an "inexorable law" of nature does, in fact, doom men to poverty and misery, there is another and a higher law, that of human brotherhood, which binds us, not merely to relieve, but, so far as possible, to prevent, suffering and want. If prevention is better than cure, then old age pensions should be better than doles and gifts. The workers of this country are

not asking for charity, in the narrow sense of that great word; they are asking for justice. And is it not just that means should be found whereby a man who has worked hard and lived respectably all his days should be enabled to make provision, or be guarded against want in old age? It does not seem to me an unreasonable request. The attempt to deal with it ought not to be a matter of political party. Whatever our politics, we ought to try and meet the need with a practical scheme.

Now there are three lines upon which such a scheme might go. One is the voluntary thrift of individuals. It is scarcely likely that any scheme will at present find favour unless it recognizes and embodies voluntary thrift. But, secondly, it is proposed that voluntary insurance—that is, voluntary thrift—should be, under proper conditions, liberally assisted by the State; or, thirdly, it is urged that everybody should be compelled by law to insure his own life, and to that insurance the State should add largely, so that an adequate pension should be available, say at sixty or sixty-five.

I.—In the first place, voluntary thrift—and voluntary thrift alone—has been tried. I am addressing, I have no doubt, many members of the great friendly societies. I am an Odd Fellow myself, and many other things. I should be the very last to wish to do injustice to those great friendly societies, and to detract from the great benefit they have conferred upon the working classes of this country. But for their friendly societies and their trades unions, the working classes would not occupy the position they do now. But I do not see in these bodies an adequate solution of the problem, for these reasons. First of all, they only help the thrifty. What of the thriftless? What of those whose wages do not allow them to save? There are many workingmen in this country whose wages do not admit of saving; they cannot save—nay, I say that they *ought not* to save. No man ought to save, if, in order to do so, he stints himself and his wife and family of food, or other necessaries to health and happiness of life. It is all very well for a man like me, who never wanted a meal in my life, to tell a labouring man he is thriftless because he has no savings bank-book and no insurance. I don't think I should save much myself on fifteen shillings a week, or even on twice that wage, if I had a wife and children to keep. That is the defect of an appeal to voluntary thrift. It is only an appeal to the minority of the working classes. The friendly societies can only provide for a minority of the workers, and those the best of their class. They represent, in short, the aristocracy of labour, and no more. Another objection is a stronger one. It is that this plan practically throws the whole burden of national insurance upon the poor. Now, if we are brethren in Christ, we ought to help to bear one another's burdens; and if we throw the whole burden of national insurance upon the poor, we are not helping them or bearing one another's burdens.

II.—The second proposal is that voluntary insurance should be aided by the State. But to this we find that there is a grave preliminary objection. It is said that State aid will pauperize men, and undermine the spirit and ground of independence. I do not believe a word of it. If a Cabinet Minister, on retiring from office, is not ashamed to take a pension while he remains out of office; if a civil servant who has served his time, or a soldier, or a policeman, does not feel ashamed to accept a pension; why should a workman? I believe that no man need be ashamed of accepting State aid. It is the least our country can do for her children when they have passed their working day. England cannot win the distinction coveted by our Chairman—of being the first European nation to adopt a system of old age pensions. We shall be almost the last. In France a workman can go before the proper officer, and declare his consent to a certain deduction from his weekly wage for thirty years from his twenty-fifth year. It is but a small deduction, and the law compels the employer to add a fixed amount, while the State pays the remainder. There is thus in France a voluntary system of insurance with State aid. But there are two objections to that system. In the first place, it only appeals to the minority—the thrifty and the earnest—and it leaves out those of the French *ouvriers* who cannot save at all. The second objection is that a similar proposal for this country met with great opposition from the friendly societies of England. This, however, might probably be arranged to their satisfaction.

III.—I take, next, the third point—compulsory insurance. People object to the principle of compulsion. I do not in this matter know why they should object. If I do not do my duty in my own calling, the bishop of my diocese will call me to order. If it is a national duty to save, it is reasonable for the State to say: "You *must* save, if it be only a small sum." That is the German method, and I think the Danish also. In Germany the system of compulsory insurance was instituted in 1891. It has thus

hardly been tried long enough to enable a conclusive verdict to be formed, or to show whether it is satisfactory or not. But its working during these three or four years has revealed certain defects in the system. It is found to be very complicated and very costly. And there is another difficulty. It is found exceedingly difficult to enforce payment of the compulsory insurance when men are out of work, and the attempts made to enforce it have made the scheme very unpopular.

Another form of compulsory insurance is the proposal of Mr. Charles Booth for universal endowment. It has one objection—its great cost. It would cost £20,000,000 a year. That is a big sum. But this is a rich country, and if we can spend every year more than that amount on big guns with which to destroy one another, I do not see why we should not find a few millions wherewith to save one another. But it is you workmen who must settle it; and that without selfishness. Consider it; think it out. It is a question for you workmen; and although statesmen and experts may finally shape it, it is from you that the mandate must come. Cannot you do something to this end in your own Parish Councils? For instance, cannot you in some way deal with the parochial charities and doles? In many cases these are simply wasted, and they amount in all to more than £1,000,000 a year.

It is a curious fact that those towns in England which are richest in charities and doles appear to be the worst in the returns of pauperism. I am sorry to learn, from a recent letter in *The Times* by Mr. C. S. Loch, that Norwich is one of the worst in this respect. In Norwich the endowed charities are said to amount to £14,000 a year, while one in seven of persons over sixty years of age is a pauper. Salisbury is another case in point; and I am sorry to say, in the presence of its bishop, that Lichfield is another. But this is a question for yourselves. I only suggest that these charities and doles might form the nucleus of a national insurance fund.

And now, speaking as a clergyman, and not only as a man to other men, it seems to me that our Master gave us a true test of a nation's greatness in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats. We should more accurately describe it as the parable of the nations, for it sets forth the judgment of "all the nations" gathered before God's tribunal. And according to that saying of the Lord, the true and ultimate test of a nation's greatness, the point on which the sentence of the Eternal Judge will turn, is not the might of her armies, the extent of her dominions, the riches of her people: it is her care of, and provision for, her own children who are suffering and outcast and poor. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto Me," is not spoken to a charitable individual. It is Christ's word to a Christian nation.

A. F. VULLIAMY, Esq., Solicitor and Clerk to the Board of Guardians, Ipswich; and a Coroner of the County of Suffolk.

THERE are two propositions in connection with the subject of old age pensions which I shall take as granted: one, that it is not well for the State to do for individuals what they can do for themselves; and the other, that the burden of taxation should fall most heavily upon those best able to bear it.

There are three schemes of old age pensions: first, provision for old age by means of compulsory deduction from earnings, an experiment now being tried in Germany, not very successfully, under much more favourable conditions than exist in England; secondly, old age pensions by means of assisted self-help, the plan advocated by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain; thirdly, the payment of old age pensions by the State to all who attain a certain age, irrespective of wealth, position, or character. It is this last which has obtained most popular favour; it is to it that I shall more especially direct my remarks.

When the question first arrested my attention, I decided to ascertain what the cost of a pension of five shillings a week would be for Ipswich, with its sixty thousand inhabitants, because it is easier for the mind to grasp small than large figures. With that view I obtained the number of deaths of persons sixty-five years old and upwards in one year. I found these to amount to three hundred, and that their average age was seventy-five. It was clear, therefore, that there were about three thousand people in Ipswich entitled to pensions, and that the total amount of such pensions would be £750 a week, or £39,000 a year, exclusive of the cost of administration, which would be heavy. This would be equal to a rate of three shillings and fourpence in the pound. If the proportion of old people were the same throughout the country, they would number 1,500,000, and the cost of old age pensions would amount to £19,500,000.

It has been said, however, that the payment of old age pensions would greatly diminish pauperism, and that the expenses so saved must be deducted from the cost of old age pensions to ascertain their nett cost to the country. That is true, and it is well, therefore, to consider to what extent the cost of pauperism would be diminished. Paupers may be roughly divided into four classes—the sick, the old, the able-bodied, and children. For three out of these four classes provision would still have to be made, and asylums, workhouses, and schools would have to be maintained for them as well as for a certain number of the old, whose increased infirmities called for a greater provision than five shillings a week, or whose vicious habits rendered detention in some place under authority advisable. The cost of administration would be increased rather than reduced, for while, on the one hand, the number of relieving officers might be somewhat diminished, hired labour in workhouses would have to be substituted for pauper work, much in them being now done by those who, though incapable any longer of earning a living, are capable of, and are the better for, a certain amount of work. The amount of present Poor Law expenses would, therefore, be reduced by somewhat less than the amount now paid in relief to those over sixty-five years of age. In order to ascertain what this deduction would probably amount to in Ipswich, I ascertained the number of aged paupers there, and the cost of their maintenance, and I found they were as follows :—

	In Workhouse.	Cost per week.	Having Out-relief.	Cost per week.	Total No.	Total cost.
Men ...	68	£17 2 0	59	£26 7 11	127	£43 9 11
Women	46		160		206	
					333	

So that of the three thousand in Ipswich over sixty-five years of age, three hundred and thirty-three are paupers, including the sick and utterly infirm, and the weekly cost of their maintenance is under £45. The additional money to be provided for Ipswich alone for old age pensions would therefore be £700 a week at least, more than three and a half times as much as the present total amount which the ratepayers of Ipswich pay to the board of guardians.

It may be said, however, and truly, that one cannot judge of the general reduction of expenditure by the experience of one place. Let me, therefore, turn to Mr. Burt's return as showing what were the number of aged paupers in England a short time since. I find from it that they then numbered about two hundred and sixty-eight thousand. Say that they are now two hundred and seventy-five thousand. The cost of their maintenance, taking the average cost in Ipswich as a guide, is less than £2,000,000 per annum, which, being deducted from £19,500,000 would leave upwards of £17,500,000, to which, however, would have to be added a very considerable amount for administration expenses, how large it is difficult to say.

How is this large sum to be raised? If by taxation of the wealthy alone, it would be pauperism in another shape; if by additional taxation of the luxuries of the poor, which are mainly beer and tobacco, they would pay an undue proportion. It has been suggested, and that seems most equitable, that it should be raised in part by a tax, such as the income-tax, paid by the well-to-do, in part by taxation of one or more of the poor man's luxuries.

It may be said, What does it matter how much has to be raised for old age pensions, provided that it is raised in an equitable manner? We all contribute, we all enjoy. Is this so? It is true that a mode of taxation might be devised by which all should contribute; but all would not enjoy the pension. The strong, and those engaged in healthy occupations, who would live beyond the age of sixty-five years, would enjoy it; but the weak and sickly, who find it difficult even now to earn a livelihood, and those engaged in unhealthy occupations, would have to contribute, but would reap no benefit, save in very exceptional cases. The weak would be taxed for the advantage of the strong; the burden of taxation would press most heavily upon those least able to bear it.

I think I have said sufficient to show that there are great difficulties and grave injustices in the way of universal old age pensions. At the same time I quite feel that for a respectable man, who has worked hard all his life, to be dependent upon Poor Law relief when he has become past work is a thing which should not be. It is important, therefore, next to consider whether a working-man can provide an old age pension of, say, five shillings a week for himself. To answer this question, we must consider, first, what it would cost so to do. The Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows can answer this question better than I can. They have recently had it under consideration,

and have issued tables which show what it would cost, in addition to their other payments, to enable their members to receive five shillings a week at sixty-five years of age, all sick pay then ceasing, these tables being prepared by their actuary, an experienced and able man. The amount for those commencing at twenty-five years of age is threepence per week. It is less or more according as the age at commencement is lower or higher. I do not hesitate to say that working-men can afford that payment. The man who can least well afford it is the married man with a large young family. Now such a man was paying till lately at least sixpence a week for the schooling of his children. With the amount he then paid, and pays no longer, he could provide for the old age, not only of himself, but his wife; and what he could do, those with a lighter burden than his can certainly do. But I am prepared to go a step further, and to assert that not only can working-men provide for old age, but that, to a great extent, they are willing to, and do so. There are two facts which certainly point in that direction; one, that whereas in 1849 the paupers numbered 62 per 1,000 of the population, in the latest period mentioned in the reports of the Local Government Board, they only numbered 26 per 1,000, a diminution of 60 per cent.: the other, that out of 1,500,000 persons in England sixty-five years old and upwards, the great majority of whom must belong to the working classes, only 275,000 are paupers. How are these facts to be accounted for, except by the fact that the great majority of working-men do make provision for all sorts of contingencies, including among them old age. It is still somewhat the fashion to talk of English working-men as thriftless. This is, I believe, and I trust to convince you, unjust and untrue. That it would be well if they were more saving is true. That applies to all classes. But I do not hesitate to say that the majority of English working-men have, of late years, become thrifty without ceasing to be generous. Consider for one moment what they have done to provide against sickness and death. In Ipswich, Odd Fellows, Foresters, and members of the Hearts of Oak friendly societies alone number 8,200, and pay in contributions more than the total yearly amount paid by the ratepayers under the guardians' contribution orders; for these members of friendly societies pay more, the guardians levy less, than £10,000 a year. The number of those not being members of friendly societies, for whom a decent burial is provided, is also very large, the number in Ipswich insured in the Prudential Insurance Society alone being upwards of 15,000, and their yearly contributions amounting to £5,900. It is frequently asserted that working-men, though willing to provide against sickness, are unwilling to provide against so remote a contingency as old age. I do not think this is true; the idea is, to a great extent, new to them, and provision is not yet made so fully as it is against sickness; but I believe that in time, and speedily, working-men will endeavour to make provision against old age, for there is nothing they like better than manly independence. I believe that the efforts of men like the present Grand Master of the Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows, Mr. Wm. Orford White, who for many years, long before old age pensions became a subject of politics, has striven for superannuation in connection with Odd Fellowship, will be crowned with as complete a success as have been the efforts of similar men to induce working-men to provide against sickness. Let me mention two facts to show that working-men are not unwilling to join benefit societies in which provision for superannuation is compulsory. In the Orwell Lodge, at Ipswich, of which Mr. White is the secretary, and which numbers 700 members, the members three years ago decided to make superannuation compulsory on all joining after that time. Obviously, if working-men did not consider it necessary to provide for old age, the effect of such a resolution would be seriously to diminish the number of those, mostly young men, joining that lodge. The contrary, however, was the result. In the two and a half years before the rule was made about 80 joined; in the two and a half years after about 100. Again, on November 24th of last year, a fresh lodge was formed in Ipswich, in which provision for superannuation is compulsory. By the end of the year, that is, in little more than a month, 56 had joined. Another lodge, the Golden Reapers, with nearly 300 members, has also since the beginning of this year made superannuation compulsory; so that there are now from 250 to 300 Odd Fellows in Ipswich who have made provision against old age. May I mention also the efforts in that direction made by many of the trades unions, who, it must be remembered, are not merely organizations for the promotion of the trade interests of working-men, but great friendly societies as well. The strongest evidence, however, that working-men do already, to a great extent, provide against old age, is to be found in the fact which I have already mentioned, that out of 1,500,000 persons in England over sixty-five years of age, only 275,000, including those who are ill, and

those who have come to poverty through extravagance, idleness, and vice, as well as respectable old persons who never could, and, therefore, never did lay by for old age, are paupers. A large majority of working-men, therefore, obviously do provide for old age. Another proof that working-men do so is to be found in the large amount of industrial savings, for all moneys that a man lays by are, to a certain extent, provision against old age. The usual investments for the savings of the working classes are savings banks, more especially the Post Office Savings Bank, house property, and land, and investments in building societies, co-operative societies, and freehold land societies. The very fact that the number of depositors in the Post Office Savings Banks in England is one-fifth of the total population, that the amount deposited in them in 1894 amounted to upwards of £30,400,000, and that the total amount now due to depositors in them is close upon £90,000,000, an increase of upwards of £8,500,000 in 1894, is sufficient to show how large an amount working-men deposit in them. With regard to the purchase of houses and land, I may mention that in Ipswich alone there are more than 2,600 freeholders, of whom the great majority belong to the working classes. The amount paid into the Co-operative Building Society in Ipswich (which is essentially a working-man's building society), amounted in 1894 to £7,400, in the Ipswich Industrial Co-operative Society to £2,450, and in the Ipswich Freehold Land Society to £37,750; the number of depositors being, in the Co-operative Building Society about 600, in the Freehold Land Society about 4,900. I do not say that the whole of this money is deposited by working-men, but against the amounts deposited by other classes must be set the moneys invested by working-men in other ways, viz., in the purchase of shares, in the funds, in bank deposits, etc., the amount of which it is, of course, impossible to ascertain.

Seeing, then, that the working classes can, and, to a great extent do, provide against old age, without assistance from the State, and that it is doubtful if there is any way by which the State can provide old age pensions which is not unjust to the weakest portion of the community, there seem to be grave objections to any present legislation on the subject, or any addition to the taxation of the country for the purpose of providing such pensions.

C. F. CLAVERHOUSE GRAHAM, Esq., Burton-on-Trent; Past Grand Master of the Manchester Unity.

IT gave me extreme pleasure to accept the invitation from the Church Congress Committee to speak upon this subject in favour of State aid, or State paid pensions, since I consider the problem one of the most serious amongst the many of our time, and one in which I have taken a steadfast interest during the past twenty years; specially in consequence of my intimate connection with the working of one of our great friendly societies, both as a past provincial officer, and as the Grand Master of the Manchester Unity during the years 1893-4. I know full well the devoted efforts put forth by that and similar benefit societies to establish upon a firm and permanent basis these pensions for the older brethren; and although our subject to-night embraces a wider area than any single friendly association, yet, since it refers to, and concerns all societies, combining both mutual benefits and ordinary thrift in their work, it will be most natural to employ the results attained by such institutions as the Manchester Unity and Ancient Order of Foresters when drawing inferences and establishing conclusions in the argument I desire to advance. Within the twenty minutes allotted to me, I will endeavour to treat as fully and succinctly as possible this enormous subject in its special bearings from the above standpoints; and because of the most limited time at disposal I will plunge into the consideration thereof without preface or introduction of any sort, beyond the single observation that the sentiments embodied are my own, and that I bind no one beyond myself to their acceptance: nor do I speak as the mouthpiece of any particular society brought within our purview, although I take it for granted that those who have favoured us with their presence possess at least an elementary knowledge of the subject, and feel a keen interest in its final accomplishment.

First, then, how comes this question of granting State-aided pensiods to such societies to arise at all? The answer is simple and sad, yet all powerful, for it reveals the fact that after long years of trial the whole of the friendly benefit societies are compelled to acknowledge that not one of them has succeeded in establishing and

securing pensions for their old brethren. The age of sixty-five years has been almost universally adopted as the age at which such pensions should commence, and tables, both returnable of contributions in case of death before sixty-five years, and non-returnable, have been promulgated; but, in spite of warnings from actuaries and the high officers of the societies, in spite of danger to the very stability itself of the districts and courts and lodges, and in defiance of all appeals, the fact remains that the Manchester Unity, out of a membership of nearly nine hundred thousand, can count only some five or six hundred members, whose contributions are made to include a pension of five shillings a week should they ever reach sixty-five years of age; whilst in the Ancient Order of Foresters, whose total membership is about the same as the Manchester Unity, the result is quite as dispiriting, and there is great reason to conclude that the remaining benefit societies are even worse off than either of these in this particular. Indeed, it may be boldly asserted, that so far as reliable data can be obtained, there does not exist five thousand members paying for pensions amongst the whole of the affiliated friendly societies, having a united membership of two millions, and with over sixty-five thousand members upwards of sixty-five years of age.

Yet under the guise of sick pay these pensions are being paid to these old members, and with most disastrous results. The Actuary of the Manchester Unity, who is opposed to State aid, has given reports to show that lodges are suffering seriously through giving Old Age Pensions under this guise of sick pay, and although the Actuary and myself do not agree upon the means to be adopted, we do agree that these pensions are the cause of the lack of solvency in all our societies. Some people are trying to make out that they are solvent, but the Actuary sums up the whole question by saying: "To-day the Manchester Unity has reduced its deficiency considerably, but it still has a deficiency of over half a million;" and if we were suddenly to be called upon to pay the whole of the claims which are promised to the members, we should have £631,265 to find somewhere before we could discharge them. What is said of the Manchester Unity can be said, I believe, to a more serious extent of every other society, for whilst the Manchester Unity's nine hundred thousand members own £9,000,000, or an average of £10 per member, the Foresters, with nine hundred thousand members, possess only £5,000,000, which shows them the absolute necessity that something must be done. Both these great societies have, for the last ten or twelve years, issued graduated tables, more or less complete, for the very purpose of the members paying to a pension fund, but the tables have been a dead letter with the exceptions above referred to; and whilst it can be safely said that every engagement entered into by benefit societies to-day may be carried out, yet it can only come to pass by the severe handicapping of the young members who are to succeed, as the following detailed reports by the actuary of typical parts of the country will more fully illustrate:—

(a) Fearful increase of deficiency, partly from reduced interest, but mainly from indiscriminate pensioning.

(b) Allowing sick benefits to take the pension form brings serious deficiency.

(c) The brethren seem to try to convince themselves that decrepitude in any form may have permanent allowances as sick pay. Such impressions must prove fatal to any benefit society.

(d) Pensions or other adverse causes keep the progress down.

(e) Alarming deficiencies frequently increased by excess of sickness and too liberal pension-like allowances.

(f) Some are evidently allowing the sick benefit to assume the annuity form, and serious results must follow if the warnings are disregarded. Sickness contributions cannot possibly provide annuity benefits.

Names are suppressed for obvious reasons, but these are examples that can be multiplied to almost any extent, and yet payments are being made continuously throughout the poorest and oldest societies, whilst the doctors decline to refuse granting certificates, even when specific sickness does *not* exist.

A monstrous accusation is sometimes levelled against me, that I am tending to injure all benefit societies by revealing these plain facts, but I need scarcely tell you that nothing can be further from my desires. No! Instead of injuring, I am most determinedly anxious to benefit the whole of the societies, believing, with Tennyson, that

> "He is the true Conservative
> Who lops the withering branch away."

No provision is made in the sick benefit subscription for any Old Age Pension, and yet the benefit is being granted in the shape of reduced sick pay. The Registrar General,

in his annual report for 1893, has told us "that the great fault of the friendly society system is an attempt to provide Old Age Pensions by means of a subterfuge The established object of friendly societies is to provide for such sickness as happens to a man when he is unable to work, and it is not the business of a sick society to provide for old age, but for a pension society, which may be established in connection." This pension society does not exist, and the sooner we awake to the facts of the case the better. Some ask that they, as benefit society members, should be left severely alone; but what may that mean? It is acknowledged that we are incapable of providing what the old members require without increased subscriptions, yet, what is our position at the present time? There are large numbers of members in workhouses, and thousands more who are dependent on their friends, and on the verge of pauperism. It is a very sad tale, but nevertheless true, and to be left severely alone is the greatest evil that can come upon them.

Everybody is agreed that there is a need of old age pensions for the poor and deserving. That opinion is universal throughout the country. The only danger I fear is that the question may become a political one, and then it will be one of the most serious and terrible calamities that can happen to the friendly societies of the country. The notion that it is derogatory or degrading to freedom or independence of members of benefit societies to accept State aid in the form of a pension for their old members, is giving way to a more sensible and reasonable view in the light of what takes place in other classes of the community. Only a short time ago the House of Commons granted a pension of £4,500 a year to the Speaker, and I have no doubt that Viscount Peel will accept that pension without feeling any loss of dignity. The judges, after fifteen years' service, are able to claim pensions from the State after having received handsome salaries for the work they have done. Cabinet ministers do the same upon pleading "insufficient means," and it is a curious fact that some of these gentlemen, who have not served the country for very long, are drawing very substantial pensions—up to £2,000 per annum for life, as the following list will show. Naval and military officers, civil servants, policemen—teachers will be included immediately—all receive pensions after so much service, as the following statements will testify:—The Right Hon. Spencer Walpole, since his retirement from the Cabinet of 1867, has been in receipt of a pension of £2,000 per annum, as ex Home Secretary. There are only four of these pensions, the other three being held by Lord George Hamilton (who, however, is not entitled to draw it whilst he is at present in office), Mr. Hugh Childers, and Viscount Cross. The latter, in consideration of the annuity, fills the post of Lord Privy Seal without salary. The "second class"—£1,200 a year for "political and civil services"—are held by Lord E. Clarence Paget (formerly First Secretary to the Admiralty), Mr. Villiers, M.P. (father of the House of Commons), and Sir M. Hicks-Beach. In the case of the last named the pension is of course withheld whilst he is in the Cabinet. Whilst Mr. Mundella lately applied for, and has for some time received, a second-class pension of £1,200 a year, on the usual grounds of *insufficient private means*. I am not going to say whether it is a good or bad principle to give pensions to these high officials—but I desire to show that pensions are no new thing, and that people do not object to receive them: although one of the most important sections of the community, who have done much to make the country what it is to-day, who are the very backbone of the country, namely, the industrial classes, are left out. Besides, resent it how they may, I can boldly assert that our very leaders have taken credit, because they have secured State aid already, and financial relief from Government charges. We are exempt from using stamps upon all friendly society documents, and the Orders effect a saving of £2,000 a year thereby. We claim return of income tax upon all our investments, and seeing that since registered friendly societies own £28,500,000, of which at least £20,000,000 is invested at an average of three per cent., you can for yourselves calculate that this rebate of income tax of 8d. in the £ cannot amount to less than the enormous sum of £20,000 relief, and therefore aids in carrying on our work. Indeed, taking the whole capital at an investment of 2½ per cent., friendly societies receive State relief to-day of not less than £24,000 a year.

Supposing we are granted this boon, will England be the only country which has done so? No. England is perhaps the only country in civilized Europe that has not embraced it. Benefit societies are recognized by the State in nearly every country except England. In France every old member receives a pension from the State. In Austria the circumstances are nearly the same. In Italy there is a much more liberal scheme. In Germany there is a complete pension scheme. In Denmark.

Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, and even in Russia, there is the same thing in operation. And yet in England we are told it is a dreadful thing to do, because it is said if we accept a pension from the State it will sap the independence of the British working-man. Do you not think in the face of the example of other countries, in the face of what is being done for certain classes in our own country, that it is time to give up that nonsense? Other men, whose services have been well paid for years, have no hesitation whatever in accepting a pension. Where is the injustice of benefit societies doing so?

Secondly—Why should the State be expected to grant such pensions? I hold—and trust at once to show, that these friendly benefit societies are of great utility, of tremendous advantage to the State, and that without such aid they will be crippled in their excellent work through sheer inability to perform more than they at present carry out. The cry wherever I go is that members can pay no more as contributions on the graduated scale, and now that juvenile lodges have become so general, a still greater claim is made upon the parents, who have to find the youngsters' contributions in addition to their own. Many of our leaders lose sight of the fact that the more they press forward and inculcate thrift, the more they tax the ordinary members, and the greater becomes the pressure upon the fathers and the mothers who find the contributions for the boys and girls, as well as for themselves, since all has to be saved and put by out of an average earning of from 16s. to 21s. a week or less. How can they be expected to do more, or ought they to do more whilst benefiting the country? I say most empathically, more cannot, and should not, be expected; and if demanded, it will in the end breed the feeling of despair. It is to me a most wonderful thing that through these benefit societies there is being paid away every day, Sundays included, in the form of sick and funeral pay, from £12,000 to £14,000, thus to an amazing extent relieving the liabilities of the Poor Law; and I hold that we have no right to call upon the members to do more. What is the result of the present state of things? I have this year obtained replies from two hundred and fifty districts, and in almost every case sick pay is granted to members over sixty-five years of age, which practically amounts to a pension, whilst nearly all of them have members in the workhouse, or dependent upon out-door relief, yet whose illness is not specific sickness according to rule.

Sir Edward Birkbeck, speaking near Norwich a few weeks ago at a friendly society gathering, said—"The time was rapidly advancing when the various great friendly societies would be bound to take up the important question of old age pensions, and he would be sorry indeed if the county of Norfolk, which had always been foremost in anything connected with benefit societies, got in any way behind in this matter. It might perhaps seem hard to the parents in these bad times, to suggest such a thing as the juveniles contributing something towards an old age pension, but it must be remembered that the younger they began the easier would it be, as the contributions would be lighter by being spread over a longer period. He would like to see that society set a good example in the country, and he would be very glad to give them a slight start in the shape of a ten-pound note." Most praiseworthy example, and a clear manifestation that outside aid is essential to their success; since more from within cannot be accomplished I feel perfectly certain.

Thirdly—Why should the State be invoked to grant pensions to such societies in preference to other thrift societies, or thrifty people in general? This perhaps may be called the crux of the whole matter, and yet it has always appeared to me easy of justification. Not that for one moment I would think lightly of all thrift associations. Far, very far otherwise; and it would be a very deep delight to me if the pension scheme should some day, and that soon, be made sufficiently wide as to embrace every worker, so that every old man and woman who could not work any longer, who were worn out and exhausted, and had consequently been driven away from the labour market, should receive something from the country they had helped to make, support, and sustain. I can only say, that I should be glad if such a wise development should be brought within our view, and that we could undertake such a task. I am, however, precluded from thinking about any such question to-day, although I have a strong conviction, held in the face of many opponents, for whom I have a great regard, that there should never be any old men or women who have belonged to a thrift society either in the workhouses, or dependent upon out relief, or their children; and yet thousands are to be found in that state to-day.

Friendly benefit societies, in their action and results, differ materially from many ordinary thrift associations. Members of building societies, and investors in the Post Office Savings Bank, pay in their cash with the full expectation and assurance,

in each individual instance, that the total amount, together with such increases in interest and bonuses as the rules regulate, shall be certain of return to each investor or his or her representative up to the last farthing so invested.

But with members of friendly benefit societies this is not the case at all. Each member pays in his stated contribution, but he or she may not, and in very many cases will not, receive back a single farthing, whilst in thousands of instances they only receive back in sick pay and funeral claim a small proportion of the amount paid in during life, so that these societies act for the mutual benefit of each other; whilst an ordinary thrift society is worked upon the pay table assurance principle merely and fully, securing to each individual depositor that which belongs to him as an investor, and nothing less. Again, in consequence of the amount of sick and funeral pay, amounting to £12,000 or £14,000 every day, disbursed by benefit societies, they lessen and keep down the poor rate of the country, and to this fact testimony is borne by every leading financier and economist who speaks upon the subject.

Mr. Tidd Pratt, as far back as 1859, when these societies were comparatively in their infancy, reported, as Registrar, that they saved the country £2,000,000 a year in poor rates; whilst the late Lord Iddesleigh, Mr. Goschen, and Sir Wm. Harcourt have borne testimony to the beneficent action of such societies, until it is not too much now to say that the benefit societies are saving the poor rate to the extent of at least one shilling in the pound on the whole assessment of £17,100,000. Just calculate this tremendous saving at, say even £2 per cent, which is extremely low, and then some idea will be formed of the national benefits these institutions are conferring upon the general ratepayer; and it is because of this immense service, together with the enormous relief to employers, through the receipt of sick pay by the employee when laid aside, they claim a right to ask that their own members, when they reach the age of sixty-five and are still struggling to keep away from the poor law, should receive a small portion of the amount they themselves have saved the country in their hey-day of strength and prosperity. Their action, likewise, in reducing pauperism, or what is much better, preventing the growth of paupers, is a main factor in the steady and rapid decrease in this direction: and one of the Royal Commissioners, speaking only last month in Hereford, declared, that "within the last twenty years, one half at least of the reduction in pauperism could be traced to the beneficent action of benefit societies." Upon these grounds, as well as upon others, did time permit of further examination, preference could be claimed, if preference must be made at all: and I much fear some such "tentative" procedure seems inevitable, especially from the pregnant words spoken lately by the Duke of Devonshire. I cordially and heartily desire that the claims of every form of thrift may be promptly considered, and amongst those in the forefront I hesitate not to place the claims of the benefit societies. Although from a logical standpoint the scheme of Mr. Charles Booth is perfectly defensible.

Fourthly—How can such a scheme be best carried out? The Duke of Devonshire has stated that whatever remedy is proposed, it must be of a "tentative" character, and that, however large might be their ideas, however large the compass in which they would embrace those who were thrifty, they must proceed tentatively. I agree with this for the present. It is because the proposal I advocate is a tentative scheme, and because we have a complete organization ready to grapple with the question, that I consider that we are the only people who hold the field with a plan which is fully practicable. We do not consider that to be the best which simply looks after everybody when they arrive at the age of sixty-five; and I am strongly of opinion that it is because this is the chief point that has been kept in view in all the discussions that have taken place that we have not gone faster. We have too closely confined ourselves to the fact that we are not to trouble about anybody until they reach sixty-five; but there are many thousands who will not be able to keep and sustain themselves until that age. The benefit societies, however, work upon a plan which is not in operation in any other school except these schools of thrift. They encourage every child to become a member, and say to that child, "If you join and pay a certain sum per week, when you are ill you will be taken care of, and from 2s. to 10s. or 12s. per week will be given you for twenty-six weeks, and if you are ill longer than that, half the several amounts will be paid you throughout illness. A fully qualified medical man and medicines will likewise be found free so long as you live, together with a funeral donation in case of death, whilst provision will be made for any widow and orphan that may be left behind. If you become a permanent sick member, the lodge, rather than allow you to go out, will strain every point, and keep you in, if at all possible, in order that you may not lose the advantages you have gained by becoming a member of the society." No outside plan includes all this except the

trades unions, some of whom embrace this special section of friendly society work. Benefit societies naturally form the best basis upon which the experiment of old age pensions can be tried. They provide for their members in sickness, find doctors and medicine free, bury them when they die, and the only thing they lack to make their system a perfect success, and to draw every young man and young woman into them, and to keep them in when there, is some plan whereby their old members may receive a pension, to enable them to enjoy the evening of life without charge or responsibility.

I hold that we have a right to go to the State and ask for the money to pay the pensions, and when that question is settled secessions will cease, benefit societies will increase by leaps and bounds, and will multiply on every side: we shall have a perfect system which will be the admiration of the world, and the salvation of industrial society in our country: whereas, at the present, other nations manifest a more sympathetic interest in the poor and helpless aged than ourselves; as, even when we have secured these pensions, we shall only be coming up to the level of other countries—although we are told that if they provide for the same thing in England, they will sap the independence of the British working-man. It is a bogey! and if the rank and file were polled to-morrow, they would say so. But I would object to receive the money from a pauper source. I would have nothing to do with the Poor Law, but would draw direct from the Treasury, and receive the cash in the same way as amounts are paid to the county councils for technical education to-day.

Wherever I go, every member of Parliament is prepared to assist the movement, and even the Duke of Devonshire must be prepared to learn, that if his word "tentative" signifies repudiation, in favour of Poor Law, and Poor Law alone, then his "wet blanket" will be thrown aside, and the question will prove itself stronger even than the noble duke, or any person or party, however powerful and exalted. Amongst all the plans as far as tentative action is concerned, I believe that of Mr. Chamberlain's comes nearest to what we are prepared to receive. That statesman was as far as the poles from the movement at one time, but like a wise man he has been content to learn from us, and now that we can place before the country a simple scheme, and one which could be carried easily, I feel sure we shall have the support and friendship of Mr. Chamberlain. The question of state control or interference which frightens so many need not alarm at all. No control is needed, and this is simply a ghost waiting to be "laid."

I have said over and over again to treasurers and secretaries, that a pension was not like sick pay—*it was a fixed sum, and its calculation was simplicity itself.* In a few words, the following are the main lines upon which the reform could be carried into practice. The several lodge or court secretaries, would send to the district secretaries, and then the district secretaries should send a return to the central secretary, giving the number of members in their lodges and courts who were over sixty-five. The general secretary would send the complete tabulated returns to the Treasury, and the Government could send officials to inspect the registers of any particular lodge, court, or district, and verify any figures about which they might have any misgivings. When they were satisfied that everything was correct, the Treasury would send a cheque to the central secretary, who would forward the amounts required to every district, where the distribution to the several old members would take place, weekly or monthly, under the direct supervision of the several officers of each lodge or court, and where the whole of the vouchers would be kept for further inspection at any time. This would simply involve a special tabulation, in addition to the general one of all members, now sent year by year to the chief registrar, and would cost an infinitesimal addition to each secretary's labours; whilst the further bugbear—that it would create an army of surveillance, is most childish, since already the checks are so many and so sure, that at any moment the Chief Registrar can put his finger upon any suspicious case, and through the post office, or the customs, can detach an inspector to report without a day's delay.

It is too simple for many of our fossilized administrators, although it will be welcomed by the rural-minded and ordinary member and officer: whilst it will contain no taint of pauperism, no germ of interference, and very little trouble in its management. Do not fear any Government. Government control has been invoked a hundred times, and is being invoked to-day, whilst its friendly and sympathetic oversight has proved to be the salvation of such societies, and there need be no more control than is exercised over county councils at present. When we make up our minds to receive it, we shall not only be doing good to our old members, and sweeten their last lone days, but we shall be still further reducing pauperism every day we live, until nothing but its

residuum will be left, and the encouragement to habits of thrift will be increased a thousandfold: whilst the millions spent upon the administration of the Poor Law, with its army of officials, will rapidly become a thing of the ugly past, and be swept away for ever.

GEORGE ABBOTT, Esq., of Messrs. Abbott Bros., Friendly Society Valuers; Conductor of the *Foresters' Miscellany.*

ALLOW me first of all to tender my thanks to the local organizers of the Church Congress for the high honour done me in being thought worthy of the compliment of an invitation to address such a meeting as this. For many years past I have been identified with that modern aspect of social development known as the friendly society movement, and have taken a leading part therein, yearly having an opportunity of addressing picked audiences of the movement; but never before have I had the pleasure of addressing a public meeting held under such auspices. It is an honour I highly esteem and gratefully acknowledge.

In dealing with old age pensions one needs to be careful and considerate. It is a great subject, and cannot lightly be disposed of. That men and women in the decline of life have need of nourishment and claims for comfort has not to be argued, 'tis past dispute. How they shall secure that nourishment and enjoy that comfort is a problem that needs much consideration, has probably had consideration since the dawn of civilization, and brings us here to-night. That it has had consideration in the times that have passed before us is plainly evident from the numerous hospitals, almshouses, etc., which are spread all over the Christian world, as evidences of the desire of those who, being blessed with "God's good gifts to men," were desirous of providing nourishment and comfort for those who were unable longer to win the same for themselves.

That the subject is now-a-days receiving more attention than any one of us can previously remember, is due probably to the fact that forethought is being more developed, and that the printing press is now more mighty than ever before. It may not be out of place here in a few brief words to bring before an audience like this a few declarations on record in regard to the "Gospel of Forethought," which are so well known, that possibly have become so common-place, as to be passed by without receiving that careful attention which they certainly demand.

Who in this audience is not familiar with that Eastern story which tells of the time when there was no dearth of nourishment, and an entire absence of cruel, carking care, when man and woman alike had not only all their present needs supplied, but had beside them that which their present needs did not demand. When, at the greatest banquet that has been recorded, the Host in pointing to the surplus fruits declared in tones of thunder, the echoes of which still reverberate throughout the land: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Theological disquisitions aside, therein lies a truth which needs teaching as much, if not more, to-day than ever before in the history of the race. Time went on, and teachers of the race found men slow to learn, and so we find the leader of a successful revolt against an enslaving power, and the greatest Law-giver the world has yet known, a Law-giver whose record remains unbroken, bent upon impressing upon his people and those who should come after them the need of forethought and provision for the future, proclaiming from an altitude high above the pyramids the never to be forgotten command, "Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do, but the seventh day thou shalt rest from thy labours."

If all the utterances of our friend Moses had been forgotten, this alone had won him immortality. To this day the followers of Moses stand pre-eminent before the world as that section of the race which has developed most the virtue of thrift, and has realized most the blessings of forethought. The six days' labour and the seventh day's rest, teaching as it does the necessity of the six days' remuneration being sufficient to provide for the period of toil and of rest, is the grandest monument of civilization which the world has yet erected.

The stream of time flowed on, and in its fulness there came along He who "spake as never man spake before," He Who in a world of greed and avarice declared in the face of priests and of Levites the glorious doctrine, "The labourer is worthy of his hire." He Who to the labourer was equally plain, and Who in the parable of the Talents enforced the glorious teaching of attention to duty and the looking ahead of the present moment; He Who in the parable of the Loaves and Fishes uttered the immortal command, "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost;" He Who whilst

insisting upon a plentiful supply and carefulness in the use thereof, had the courage to declare that "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

Coming later on, and though uttered by a lesser light, we need to bear in mind the grand injunctions, "Be not *slothful* in business, but fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." So much for the teachers which have gone before.

The labourer is worthy of his hire, and where the labourer realizes that the hire is worthy of his best labour, the hire should be ample to provide for the days of toil and of rest. The toil which honestly exerted wrings from mother earth sufficient for all the wants of man, should be so rewarded that each of the toilers may have opportunity of providing honestly in the sight of all men for the days when they can "neither toil nor spin."

From the dawn of civilization down to the present, the history of the race has been a history of struggle and of success. Success, however, only to those who in the exercise of forethought have so gathered up the fragments that nothing was lost. All the victories which have yet been won, whether in peace or war, have been won by forethought, and every defeat recorded may be traced to the lack thereof.

The truths enunciated by the Carpenter of Nazareth are as true to-day as when He traversed the land of Palestine, and "if Christ came to Norwich" He would doubtless be as earnest in teaching the gospel of forethought as He was in the days of old. The race is not yet perfect, nor is the individual fully developed. Time was when in this our native land, this tight little Isle of Britain, the weaker specimens of the race were bodily held in bondage by the stronger ones, and even yet it cannot be said they are completely free. Time was when they were chattels of the soil, and when the holder of the human chattel was as responsible for the feeding of him as for the chattel quadruped. Such a state was not completed development. The human chattel then had bread. He was not then concerned about old age pensions. The common folk then had no responsibility. They were chattels. They had bread, but to their yearning though undeveloped souls there came words out "from the mouth of God," and each to the other said, "*Are we not men?*"

Then feudalism fell, and manhood took another step forward in development, and men and women began to realize the burden of responsibility. These are the burdens which are needful to develop the race, and prelate or politician who would lessen the responsibility of men and women has small claim to be considered as the best friend of the race. "Though he split the ear of the groundling, yet he cannot but make the judicious grieve."

Development throughout nature's vast domain is slow of growth, the development of man not excepted. The doctrine that all men are equal born is true only so far as the manner of their natural birth is concerned. Otherwise the quality of mankind is as diverse as the stars in the firmament, and yet is as esential to the whole fabric of creation. To meet the glaring inequalities of nature's bestowal of her numerous gifts, and to minimise as much as possible the evil effects of weaknesses, should be the aim of true civilization. Now-a-days we hear much and read more of the necessity of allowing equality of opportunity and equality of reward. Equality of opportunity may be facilitated by wise and generous laws, but "equality of reward" can only be expected to prevail when we have equality of ability and equality of exertion. Equality of ability is not the gift of man. Equality of exertion may only be attained by the development of the moral and physical qualities. Much may be done in this direction, but much cannot be done in a hurry. Development is of slow growth. Evolution is not of a day. "Rome was not built in a day."

We hear much now-a-days of the doctrine that "Labour is the source of wealth." To that needs to be added, "Carefulness is the cause of wealth." 'Tis not the simple income which gives wealth, but the careful utilization of that income. We need always to remember to "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost." Men and women must fix the standards of their own lives, and, having fixed those standards, must be determined to attain them. Let them remember the adage which declares "Where there's a will there's a way."

Time was, not long ago, when the workers of Britain were content with a standard which only required them to provide for times of prosperity. In days of adversity, whether caused by sickness or the fluctuations of trade, they were content to "fall upon the rates." Yet even then there were amongst them those who felt that this stage of incomplete development was unsatisfactory; who realized that "man shall not live by bread alone," who felt that man required constantly to be reminded that "the ideals of yesterday fall short of the requirements of to-day." Their conception

of manhood taught them that it was as much their duty to provide for periods of sickness and lack of employment as it was to provide for the wants of the Sabbath day. Then came the development of those mutual organizations which have done more for the working classes during the past fifty years than all the legislators at Westminster, and which are the pride of all who understand them, trades unions, co-operative societies, and friendly societies.

Trades unions, as being the means which enable the worker to secure more adequate wage and a fairer share of the profits resulting from his own labour, must be placed first, and it is to be hoped will always be the first consideration of the labourer.

Co-operative societies, which, by enabling the labourers to live as near cost price as is possible, diminishing as much as possible the cost of present maintenance, and leave him a larger margin of reserves to provide for the future, must come second.

Friendly societies, though last mentioned, must not be considered as of least importance, for they enable their members to look into the future and to provide for all known contingencies. All of these organizations, demanding as they do the exercise of forethought, teaching as they do the need of "gathering up the fragments that nothing be lost," have very materially aided in the development of the race and consequent uplifting of the nation. Each of these organizations impresses upon men and women that carefulness is the cause of wealth, and that by its exercise they may secure a fairer share of the good things of this life than they could possibly otherwise obtain.

When the working classes are fully alive to their own permanent interests, and organize and maintain these three aspects of development, they can without doubt provide for themselves all their requirements.

'A workman's wage is the recompense of his labours, and, given on his part diligent and intelligent labour, should be ample to meet all his requirements. What those requirements may be the workman can alone determine. If his requirements are satisfied with parochial aid in seasons of distress, his wage will assuredly be small. If he is determined that his wage shall enable him to provide against those seasons of distress, he will assuredly devise means of securing an increased wage, and this workers have certainly done during the last half century. There is no disputing the fact that the volume of wage is now greater per head than it was, and that there is a much higher standard of life prevailing amongst the common folk than formerly. When the worker is impressed with the need of providing for his wants in old age, so assuredly will he be determined to secure such an increased wage as will enable him to make that provision. Whenever the worker admits that his wage cannot be made to allow him to do so, he must at the same time admit that in his case development has been arrested.

"Drive no starvelings, scraggy grown,
Loose legged, and ribbed and bony;
Like those who grind their noses down
On pastures bare and stony."

State-aided old age pensions is no new cry. Tom Paine, the "bogey man" of the last century, in his "Rights of Man," set forth the doctrine, and stipulated that every poor person upon arriving at sixty-five years of age should be allowed £10 yearly out of the imperial revenue, in return for the taxation paid in earlier years. Tom Paine died and was buried, but his spirit has risen again. His ghost now haunts the land. During the last twenty years the doctrine of old age pensions has been revived. In the early period of this agitation a distinguished Churchman led the van, and was to the fore, calling for the establishment of a compulsory old age pension fund, on the ground that it would "save the rates" by diminishing the demands on the poor rate, and ratepayers were urged to support the scheme on that account. We were told that it would "abolish the Poor Law." Later on the well-to-do classes were advised to help forward the movement for the establishment of a compulsory old age pension fund, to which every person, "from prince to peasant," should contribute, on the assurance that the well-to-do classes would get more than their fair share of the fund. The determined opposition of the friendly societies, and the common sense of the workers generally, were, however, sufficient to upset that "apple cart."

In later years prominent politicians have taken up the cry, and we have had no end of suggested State-aided old age pension schemes; in fact they have been so numerous as to resemble that historic garment, Joseph's many coloured coat.

A statesman now occupying a responsible position in her Majesty's Government, has had some hand in promulgating more than one suggested scheme. In one

of his early utterances, he said he had calculated that a farthing per week in every shilling earned by a working man, compulsorily deducted from his weekly wage, and a similar amount paid by his employer added to a similar sum found by the State, would give every man upon arriving at sixty years of age an annuity of £20 so long as he lived, and in event of death before reaching sixty years of age, allow of the workman's farthing in the shilling being returned to his family.

Another scheme is said to have required an immediate deposit of two hundred million pounds, and an annual addition of fifty million pounds sterling. It has been suggested that persons who desired to secure old age annuities should pay a portion of the required premium, and the State should pay the remainder. This scheme would not help the really poor worker, but would help those who were able to help themselves. One scheme put forward by a parliamentary caucus suggested that if working-men would pay to Government the sum of £5 before they arrived at twenty-five years of age, Government would add thereto the sum of £15, and if the working-man would continue to pay £1 yearly afterwards until he arrived at sixty-five years of age, he should be entitled to an annuity of £13 so long as he lived. In case of death before arriving at sixty-five years of age, certain allowances were to be returned to the representatives of the deceased. Reliable calculations proved beyond doubt that under a scheme similar to this, providing that all men upon arriving at twenty-one years of age subscribed thereto the sum of £1 yearly until his death, or arrival at sixty-five years of age, the State would in the course of eighty years from its establishment, assuming that the accumulating funds were invested continuously, so as to realize interest at the rate of two and a half per cent. compounded yearly, have made a net profit of £451,353,720, after meeting all claims upon the fund. Is there any inducement there to join a national compulsory pension fund?

Latterly we have been asked by Mr. C. Booth and others to consider the desirability of a national endowment of old age—the endowment to come direct from the State: and to which every member of the State—the prince, the peer, the prelate, and the plebeian—are all alike to be entitled, upon arriving at sixty-five years of age, to an allowance of five shillings per week during the remainder of their natural life.

Now, in all national undertakings, it is an essential that every citizen must in some form or other contribute thereto, that all having contributed, all alike may partake of the advantages. But hitherto the State has only been allowed to undertake that duty which can be demonstrated will be an advantage to the people generally, and which in time of stress will equally protect the whole.

The State undertakes national defence, because all men are agreed that combined action is absolutely necessary, and because it is not possible for each individual citizen to wield the weapons of defence. Local authorities undertake by the police service to defend social life and personal holdings, because each individual cannot afford the time to be his own policeman. Poor Law authorities undertake the care of poor persons, because in a civilized land poor persons cannot be allowed to die of hunger; and to enable poor persons readily to obtain food and shelter. The State in Britain does not undertake those duties which experience proves ordinary men and women can discharge themselves.

The proposal of Mr. Booth and others has about it this plausibility, that it appears capable of encompassing the nation. We may, however, ask, "Does the nation need to be thus encompassed?" It may be asked is it *necessary* thus to endow prince, peer, or prelate with the munificent sum of five shillings weekly in order to make their "life worth living?" It may be asked, "Will the plebeian, who has no other source of endowment, but who has still to labour for his daily bread, be really benefited by this munificent sum of five shillings weekly?" The income of itself will be insufficient to meet his requirements, and he will need still to labour for his daily bread. In the flooding of the labour market the aged labourer, anxious to secure sufficient for his maintenance, will, so long as human nature remains what it is, be as anxious to obtain the balance, and as readily undersell his neighbour as he does now. Look around you. Are there no army pensioners in Norwich whose pensions, being insufficient to provide the comfort of the barrack-room, compel them, in order to secure that modicum of comfort, to offer their services at a lower rate, than men who have not the pension, would accept?

Public pensions, to be of any real service to the people, must be so ample as to remove the pensioner entirely from the labour market. If they fail to do this, they are merely "rates in aid of wage," and are a curse in disguise. Nay, more. They demonstrate that so far as the pensioner is concerned, he is still a *bond slave*, unable to assert his right to the divine charter which proclaims the "labourer is worthy of

his hire." Let the worker accumulate in any form he likes such a competence as will enable him to make out his lessened wage in old age, and the very fact that he has that competence will give him a standing in the land which his fellows have not. He will not need to work so many hours as without his own help, and he will assuredly be able to secure a higher remuneration for his lessened hours of labour than would be the case if he were known to have a public pension. Many people who advocate universal State pensions have vague ideas of the cost thereof. They forget that the State has no money of its own, that it can only raise money for its varied requirements by taxation of the people.

Many have been the methods suggested for raising the revenue for the purpose of old age pensions. They have ranged from a tax on wheels to one on pawnbrokers' tickets. None of them have suggested an increase of workmen's wages. As to the probable cost of this modest pension of five shillings per week, few people appear to have any idea. Listen to what Mr. Thomas Fatkin, of Leeds, says thereon :—"The present annual cost to provide five shillings per week to all persons sixty-five years of age and upwards would be £42,447,829. You may form some idea as to how such an annual charge will increase in the future, when I assert that £31,063,656 per annum would have provided five shillings per week for all persons sixty-five years of age and upwards in 1851. If, therefore, the population increases in the same proportion during the next forty years as it has increased during the past forty years, the annual cost in 1932 will be nearly £60,000,000 per annum. These figures are exclusive of all costs for management expenses." This opinion and estimate of an expert deliberately expressed in the year 1892, has not, so far as I am aware, yet been challenged. Just imagine the present Chancellor of the Exchequer being asked to impose new taxes calculated to bring in at once forty-two millions and a half yearly. Why, the Budget of 1894 would be forgotten at once. I am not saying that the nation is too poor to provide this sum. But I do say that if the nation is rich enough to provide the same for old age pensions, most of which would be absorbed by people who are already well enough endowed, the country is rich enough to pay that additional amount yearly in wages to the wage earners, and so enable them to provide for their own old age.

Man is a responsible being. To rob him of his responsibility is to degrade him. The working class should rise to the occasion, should insist upon being capable of using their own wage to their own advantage. They should by all means endeavour to secure a higher present wage rather than to accept a deferred wage. Poverty and inability to labour comes not only with old age. Ordinary observation will convince anyone that the volume of suffering and distress arising from inability to earn "the needful" is greater before sixty-five years of age than afterwards. Day by day do we read of cases like this:—

"FOUND DEAD AT HER MACHINE.

"Dr. Westcott received particulars of the sad death of Marion Starck (47), the wife of an engineer, of Weston Place, Hackney. It appears that the husband of the deceased had been out of work for a very long time, and for the last twelve months the deceased has worked very hard at boot machining in order to support herself and him. At 12.30 yesterday the poor woman was found sitting in her chair at her machine in front of her work quite dead. She had evidently passed away while engaged at her work."

Who, pray, has profited by the payment of wages to those "Veterans of Industry," who, during their long working life, have been unable to provide for their comfort in old age?

Certainly not that abstract entity we call the State. The State in its official capacity has not benefited by their ill-payment. There is not stored up in the strong chest of the Government any money collected from the labours of the ill-paid. The money saved by those miserable wages stand to the credit of private individuals. Why, then should other individuals be charged with having benefited by the poverty of those who have been unable to provide for themselves. Why should they be called upon to contribute to the deferred wage?

But it is said the inexorable law of supply and demand rules here. Then let the worker demand higher wages for a higher life, and the supply will come.

If the resources of the State are to be called into activity to endow comfortable old age, why should it not be also called into activity to relieve present sufferings?

Are there no widows and orphans in the land? Are there no men and women now who, willing to work, yet lack the work which would bring them food? The

advocates of State endowment of old age point to the fact that soldiers and civil servants and the servants of various municipal bodies are assured of pensions, and ask why should not the veterans of industry be as well cared for? To that I answer—(1) That soldiers and civil servants, etc., have at the outset entered into a contract to give constant service at a non-fluctuating wage. (2) That in consequence of that non-fluctuating wage, the State profits from the early deaths of its servants, and gives a portion thereof to those stronger lives which live into the pension age. (3) That in view of constant employment, the employés have accepted a lower present wage in the hope of securing by length of life some portion of their fellows' wage in the shape of a deferred annuity. (4) That the principle of a deferred wage has lightened the taxation necessary to provide the present wage, and has at the same time treated the wage-earner as an irresponsible person, incapable of taking care of his own inheritance. (5) That if the advocates of old age endowment, in relying on this their favourite illustration, desire to be consistent, they should become Socialists. Then advocate the nationalization of trade and commerce, making each worker the direct employé of the State.

As a worker, I prefer to have and to advocate present wage in preference to a deferred wage. I think I am as capable of dealing with my wage as any other person, and I think I can spend it as well. Not only so, but I think the person who says to me, "It will be better for you that I should provide for the time when you will become old and unable to earn your living," degrades me and mankind generally. I think that I am capable of providing for myself, and say "Hands off." Further, I think that I am no special creation. Other men are as capable of undertaking their responsibilities as I am, and I advise all men, whether of the ordinary artisan class or not, to stand up for the development of the race. Insist as free men upon being the masters of your own destiny.

But, say the advocates of old age endowment, the Education Act has benefited the workers and has not degraded them. To that I answer—(1) The Education Act has dealt with children who required training and development, and who could not think for themselves, and that whilst it may be absolutely needful to nationalize education for the purpose of making more perfect the development of future generations, it does not follow therefore that when those persons assume the status of men and women they need the same attention. If that were so, then indeed would education be a failure. (2) That the monetary easement of the parents in the matter of free education is a fallacy. In this case the State has simply assumed the character of the usurer. It lends to the parents the school fees of the present, on conditions that after school age the parents shall continue to make repayments in the shape of taxation during the remainder of their natural lives.

Aged people should have comfort and nourishment in their closing years. All people who honestly believe it a duty to labour whilst in health, should be able to provide for the time when, through ordinary circumstances, they are unable to labour. For the meeting of extraordinary circumstances, we have the Poor Law. The Poor Law as at present existing is capable of meeting all wants arising out of circumstances over which the citizen has no control. And to the citizen who is broken in life from causes over which he had no control, there should be no degradation in seeking assistance from that fund to which he has contributed all his working life. To the Poor Law and its humane administration I am content to look for aid for those present aged people who have not had opportunity in the past to provide for themselves. If the method of local administration in any locality fails to win the approval of the ratepayers, they can amend such administration. By the practical abolition of the property qualification, working-men who are embued with civic patriotism, and are prepared earnestly to give the necessary time to this branch of public work, have now full opportunity of "capturing" seats on the various bodies charged with the administration of the Poor Law, and of at once putting into operation old age pensions for *those who need the same*—for those who need them; whilst for those who do not need them there is no necessity to operate any law, new or old.

After years of study, as a working-man, I am convinced that the only proper solution of old age pensions is a more adequate wage, and more careful distribution of that wage. I am not one of those who believe that Parliament can increase the *volume* of wage, but I do believe that Parliament can do much towards increasing the *power* of the wage. The volume of wage has undoubtedly risen very considerably during the past forty years, and that mainly, I might almost venture to say entirely, by the action of the workers themselves. In the same period the power of the wage has also been greatly increased through the action of Parliament in

the abolition of taxes upon various necessaries of life, and may yet be further increased.

Whilst there need be no less attention paid to the development of quadrupeds, there does need more attention to the development of human beings. Cannot the housing of the people be improved? Cannot more attention be paid to the securing of sound wholesome food and drink for the people? Is there not room for much improvement in the workshops of the people? And would not a combination of these matters, and an inculcation of self-restraint, and an expansion of healthful attitudes do much to improve the moral and physical tone of the people? Is it not reasonable to suppose that with more attention paid to these details there would come to all who practise them a higher development, in the same manner as the higher developed specimens of the race now existing have come from a lower strata than that they now occupy?

I am firmly of opinion that whenever the higher developed members of the race, in the form of legislators for the State, shall attempt to provide a reward in any shape or other, whether of old age pensions or otherwise, without requiring and having the power to insist upon the performance of some plain specific duty, the performance of which shall excite the desire to obtain the reward, the State will not only retard the development, but will perpetuate the enslavement of the less developed members of the race.

Our friends the clerics have immense opportunities and power of helping forward the development of the character of the people. To them many look for guidance in passing through the life which now is to that which is to come. Let them use those opportunities and that power in promoting the attainment of a higher life on earth. Let them by example, as well as precept, demonstrate that they are really desirous of assisting the development of all that is good. Let them encourage all things that have the best appearance of permanence and stability, and let them discourage all things which are not calculated to bear the test of time. As they would discourage reckless trading in the ordinary paths of commerce, so let them discourage any form of friendly society which on the face of it will not bear the test of time. Let them eschew slate clubs and Tontine societies, and as they teach of eternity, let them deal only with those things which approach the nearest to it. Let them encourage only sound permanent friendly societies, which at the least look forward to the end of the life of the individual. These are numerous: I need not particularize them.

In a truly civilized country it should be the aim of the Government to at least afford the same opportunities for the practise of virtue as for indulgence in vice. I am afraid this has not been the case in Britain in the past. In the past there has been such a desire to secure revenue, that spending departments and decoys have been erected on every hand. There needs reform. Men and women are very much creatures of imitation. The more opportunity they have of indulging in any particular matter the more generally do they indulge, and I am firmly of opinion that if during the last thirty-five years there had been opened a Post Office Savings Bank by the side of every house newly licensed for the sale of alcoholic drinks, there would have been much less need to talk about old age pensions. Let politicians and parsons join hands together to help forward that experiment, and they will, I am sure, earn the gratitude of the people.

Fellow workers, do your utmost to secure increased wage, and at the same time be determined to use that increased wage with greater carefulness, remembering that you are responsible beings, and that in your own hands lays your own destiny. Remember what I have said as to the costliness of State-aided pensions, and bear in mind there are numerous agencies in active operation by means of which you may—at least such of you as are under forty years of age—secure old age pensions by your own provision. For people under this age the price to be paid is not prohibitive, if only you are really desirous of securing yourselves against the pressure of lessened wage in old age.

Your trades union will enable you to secure greater wage; your co-operative society will enable you to live at cost price; and your friendly society can enable you to purchase the annuity. 'Tis all a question of ability and inclination. You desire to live into old age. You desire to be comfortable in your old age. Your standard of comfort must be fixed by yourselves, and you must be determined to exert yourself to attain that standard.

In these days, when we hear so much about the nationalization of the means of production, of distribution, and of exchange, it is more than ever necessary to impress upon men and women the need of preserving their own individual character.

Remember the kingdom of heaven "is at hand." There is no need to wait for a future life beyond the grave. Be determined that your future life this side the grave shall be better than has been your past life; that you will assert your manhood and your responsibility; that you will be equal to your responsibility. Use the means at your disposal, and if the means are insufficient to yield the desired result, create other means. Do not be led away with that sophistry which would treat you as children. Assert your manhood.

"Up, my comrades! up and doing!
Manhood's rugged play
Still renewing, bravely hewing
Through the world our way!

Let us each be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate;
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labour and to wait."

S. ANDREW'S HALL,

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 11TH, 1895.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT in the Chair.

VOTES OF THANKS.

SAMUEL HOARE, Esq., M.P.

BEFORE the curtain falls on the Congress, there are various thanks we desire to tender to those who have carried through the arduous duties connected with it, and who have taken part in it. It is my pleasant duty to ask you to join in a very hearty vote of thanks to the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, and I feel our thanks are due to him, not merely for the active and able part which he has taken in our proceedings, but also for the fact that it was owing to him that the Congress has been held in Norwich in 1895. I am sure we should like to offer him our warmest congratulations on the success of the work which has been carried on in Norwich during the last four days. We began our work with a glorious service in the cathedral. Immediately thereafter we had the interesting address presented to his lordship by the Nonconformists of Norwich, which showed that while primarily our work was the work of the Church, we had the sympathy, not merely of Churchmen, but of the Nonconformists also. It is for that reason that I am extremely glad to propose this vote of thanks, for as one of the Parliamentary representatives of this old city, I have the great honour of representing, not only the members of the Church, but the members of all the Nonconformist bodies of the city at the same time. I propose, then, that we offer our warmest thanks to the Bishop, and also that the motion shall include the Lady President of the Congress, Mrs. Sheepshanks. Not merely for her kind hospitality and his lordship's hospitality at the palace will she be remembered by those who have visited Norwich at this time, but many—the ladies especially—will remember with pleasure the very able words she addressed to them on the two occasions on which she spoke. I offer you, my Lord Bishop, our very warmest thanks for the manner in which you have presided at the Congress, and, as a member of this diocese, for the deep interest you have taken, not merely on this occasion, but on every occasion, in the work of the great diocese over which you so ably preside.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

MR. HOARE, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN—Those of you who belong to our own diocese are probably by this time well aware that I do not at all like votes of thanks,

and I always get out of them, if possible, at any meeting where I preside. But I suppose we are all in some degree conservative in these matters, and I was told it was the usual practice at the Congress. As it is the usual practice, so let it be. I am greatly obliged to you for the very cordial way in which this vote of thanks has been proposed and responded to by you. I should like it to be clearly understood, with reference to what has been said about inviting the Congress to come here, that I was very far from taking the initiative in the matter. It would have been strange if I had done so, because I was the junior Bishop on the bench, and I may add that it has not been a part of my experience to act as chairman of large assemblies. But we had an intimation from our friend on the left that "Barkis is willing"—that if we would send an invitation, the Congress would like to come here. Well, when it is put in that way, I am not one who would shirk responsibility; and when I was told that it was the wish of the Congress to come here, I sent a warm invitation, and our diocese responded very heartily. It would, I think, be in accordance with the usage on these occasions for me to say that I looked forward to the Congress with considerable anxiety and trepidation of spirit, and that now I feel at last immeasurably relieved. But I cannot honestly say anything of the sort. Speaking seriously, I felt that everyone connected with the Church and with the city of Norwich was desirous of making the Congress a success; that everyone was doing his best to make it a success; that no efforts were being spared by anyone to promote the success of the Congress; and that, when that had been done, I, for my own part, was quite willing to leave the matter in the hands of God, knowing that many earnest and fervent prayers were continually being offered up in the diocese for the success of our meeting. I believed that by God's goodness, He would vouchsafe us His blessing. I ought to say that, with regard to all the preparations for the Congress, no thanks were due to me personally, because I have been entirely relieved in the matter. Owing to the large size of the diocese, it was impracticable for me to take part in the work of the Committees. The actual labour has fallen upon others, and especially upon the Secretaries; and I would particularly mention the name of my valued and esteemed friend Archdeacon Nevill. His labours have been unwearied; and if there has been success it has been largely owing to his unceasing and untiring efforts. The Subjects Committee also, of which the Dean was the chairman, laboured most incessantly at the work before them, and with great wisdom and prudence conducted all they had to do with the excellent results which you have seen at this Congress. Well, we have arrived at the end of our Congress, and I think and hope we may say that it has, by the goodness of God, been greatly blessed. We had, of course, some things against us. That we could expect. The proverbial fickleness of the weather has made it worse for us than usual at this time of the year in East Anglia. But that never dispirits me. There is an excellent sentence in "Tom Brown's School Days," about the pleasure every true Englishman feels in holding out against something. I hold that opinion too with Mr. Hughes, and I hope others have the same idea. If the weather has been unpropitious, we are not responsible for that. It is the most foolish of all things continually to be complaining about the weather; and in spite of the weather, the attendances have been very good, showing that the bulk of the members have been really interested in the Congress. The subjects have been well chosen; the papers read have been excellent, and the meetings, speaking generally, have been of a highly interesting character. I have been told by some *habitués* that this Congress has been a great success, and that it has been a particularly useful Congress; and one friend who has been at every Congress told me last night that this had been a very solid and useful Congress, and one that will be looked back upon as one of the best yet held; and I believe that that will be the conclusion generally come to. There is one thing for which I in my position humbly and devoutly thank God. I have not been a Congress-going man, but I certainly was never at any Congress which would bear comparison with this one with regard to the entire absence of everything that was regrettable. I think that is a matter for deep thankfulness. As far as I know, I do not believe there has been a single thing said at any of the meetings which can be a subject of regret. I do not think there has been a reason why any gentleman who has spoken at the meetings should have any cause for regretting what he said. The spirit has been admirable. There have been lively meetings, but they have been good humoured. There was nothing unkind; no stabs; no cruel or unkind things said. I think the temper has been admirable; and for that I feel very thankful, and desire humbly to express my gratitude to Almighty God. I thank God for the measure of blessing He has vouchsafed to our Congress, and I trust He will give us yet more and more from it. I am sure that a great deal of good seed

has been sown; the Word of God in many of its aspects has been preached; and I pray that the seed sown may bring forth fruit abundantly.

The Right Rev. A. T. LLOYD, D.D., Bishop of Thetford.

I HAVE been asked to perform a pleasant and an easy duty. It is to propose a very hearty vote of thanks to his Worship the Mayor of Norwich. It is pleasant, because it is always a pleasant thing to be thankful; and it is easy, because it will require very few words of mine to commend it to your warm sympathy and appreciation. We may not forget the removal from our midst of one who undertook the office of Mayor, with the full expectation of presiding over this city at the time of our Congress, and of giving it a hearty welcome. We know with what kindly eagerness he was anticipating that event; but God willed it otherwise. We may not forget also how kindly and generously the present Mayor entered into the breach that was left; and, although last year was a year of very heavy office and responsibility for him, still he most kindly took the office this year, and has behaved to us with his usual entire courteousness and generosity in giving the Congress a welcome to Norwich. It is for that we specially thank him. Many of you were present at the cordial reception which he gave us at the Guildhall. That tone of welcome set the keynote to our proceedings, and we valued his words of welcome. But we thank him, not only for what he has done for us in the past, but for favours to come. We are most of us anticipating a very happy and pleasant evening on the Mayor's invitation at the fine old castle of this city. While these Congresses of ours have their serious and very useful side, they have also that which constitutes one of the most pleasant elements—their social side. It is of no small moment in coming to these gatherings to know that we shall meet old friends and renew old acquaintances, but the difficulty is where to meet, and in our greetings in the market-place we generally have but a short time to converse together. But the Mayor is going to entertain us with his hospitality this evening, and that will afford us the opportunity of meeting together in social intercourse, which we shall all appreciate. I have great pleasure in moving "a vote of thanks to the Mayor and Corporation of Norwich for the cordial welcome they have given to the Congress; for their kind assistance in placing S. Andrew's and Blackfriar's Hall at the disposal of the Committee, and for the generous hospitality shown by them, as well as by the citizens generally."

R. C. GILMAN, Esq., Deputy-Mayor of Norwich.

MY LORD.—The Mayor, Sir Peter Eade, being unavoidably absent, I desire to express his thanks for the very kind expressions in the motion. I am sure that the Mayor has had the greatest possible pleasure in welcoming this Congress, and I know that he has desired to do everything possible to promote its interests, and he will be gratified at the success which has attended its meeting in our old city of Norwich. So far as the citizens are concerned, I think I may speak for them; and as a member of the Corporation, I can say that we have had pleasure in placing these halls at the disposal of the Congress; and I think they have proved well suited for the purposes to which they have been applied. They are spacious buildings, and large numbers have been brought together with the least inconvenience; while the citizens have endeavoured to dispense hospitality in a way that has, I hope, been satisfactory to those who came amongst us. Later in the evening the Mayor will himself have an opportunity of personally receiving you at the conversazione which he gives at the Castle Museum.

The Rev. and Worshipful T. ESPINELL ESPIN, D.D., Chancellor of Chester and Liverpool, and Prolocutor of the York Convocation.

MY LORD BISHOP—The resolution I have been asked to move is the following:—"Thanks to His Grace the Archbishop of York, and the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, for their sermons at the opening of the Congress, and also to those gentlemen who so kindly accepted the invitation of the Subjects Committee to attend as Readers and Speakers." This resolution needs very few words, or no words at all,

to commend it to your acceptance. If I mention any of the papers, I do not mean to say that the papers not mentioned are less worthy than those mentioned. It is impossible for anyone to have been in all the places at the same time. The resolution makes mention of the Archbishop, and as the late Prolocutor of the Convocation of York, I am proud to think he has been mentioned in this resolution. I venture to think his was a memorable sermon—one that has brought before us suggestions which will be useful to us in making up our minds as to overtures about reunion from those on either side of our *via media*. I read the sermon of the Bishop of Salisbury, and thought it also a most useful sermon; and some of the papers that have been read this week have been as valuable and useful as any ever read at any of these Congresses. I think the paper read by the Lord Bishop of Peterborough one of the most striking and helpful papers I have ever read; and I sincerely hope that the paper read by the Dean on the subject of the financial distress of the clergy has not fallen on barren ground, but will produce some practical action on the lines of his suggestions. Chancellor Blofeld's paper on the same subject was a helpful and business-like statement of the case. Other papers were, no doubt, equally good, or at any rate attained a very high order of excellence; and for all, I think the members of the Congress ought to be grateful, and to concur heartily in this resolution.

The Right Rev. H. W. YEATMAN, D.D., Bishop of Southwark.

I HAVE been asked to return thanks on behalf of those who are referred to in this resolution. I believe, with your Bishop, very strongly that it is an excellent thing for character to have something to hold out against. Well, I have always held out against public speaking, but I daresay even your Bishop has discovered that sometimes it is necessary to yield, and I am here now a specimen of the men who have failed to hold out. But with regard to these meetings, I have felt that these great abnormal Congresses—abnormal because they do not hold any exact place in the Church's scheme—have nevertheless, by the grace of God, been a means of forming the public opinion, not only of the Church, but of those outside the Church. Many vital questions from within and from without have come up, puzzling us at first, and even threatening our existence; but, presently, by the aid of these Congresses, they have sunk down under God's will, and left the Church stronger in truth and in men's affections than before. We cannot, therefore, ask you to thank us for taking part in such things, for to aid in this particular work of forming the opinion of the Church is a privilege and a duty. In the present instance, the duty has been made a pleasure because of the astonishing and overwhelming cordiality and hospitality of the city of Norwich. It has not only been a working visit for some of us, but to all a visit of great pleasure, owing to your hospitality and to the delightful interest attaching to this ancient city.

G. HARWOOD, Esq., M.P.

I HAVE been asked to move a vote of "Thanks to the different Committees whose arrangements have conduced so materially to the success of the Congress." I have attended a good many Congresses, and I know something of the work of these different Committees, and especially of the Selection of Subjects Committee. Arrangements like these are very complicated and require great care, great attention, and great judgment. I have previously attended Congresses as a speaker. I have been here in the humbler capacity of one writing day by day an account of a part of the country not hitherto much interested in these affairs. As a member of Parliament who sits upon the Liberal benches and is proud to sit there, I would only add this one remark, that if the Church would carry into her work the temper and spirit which have marked this Congress, she need have no fear for the future.

The Very Rev. WM. LEFROY, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

IN the name of the various Committees summarized in the resolution just proposed, and so kindly supported by you, I beg to thank you for your acknowledgment and expression of kindness for their labours. The committees are numerous—the General Committee, the Subjects Committee, the Finance Committee, the Finance and

Buildings Committee, the Workmen's Committee; and each of them was willing, as his lordship has said, to advance the interests of the Church, and to render this Congress—what I venture to think it is proved to have been—a Congress of great success. But the Subjects Committee has had to bear the labouring oar. We have had an enormous number of subjects presented to us, and we had to make a selection. Some were very remarkable, and I daresay we could find some such as, "How to bring the moon nearer the earth." But we did not want to trouble you with that subject, nor ask you to consider the mathematical problem of "How to square the circle." Instead, we have presented subjects which have presented old ideas, at all events in new lights, and have endeavoured to bring up the ideas of Churchmen to modern requirements and modern thought. In connection with the Subjects Committee, I must say that really and truly the labouring oar of this Congress has been borne, wonderful to state, by a member of the capitular body. We have heard some hard things said of that body to-day. We are not much distressed about it. But Archdeacon Nevill has worked very hard in connection with our proceedings from beginning to end. I do not know how he is to preserve his good looks and health without having Congress work to do. He is said to be occasionally menaced by gout; he has not had a twinge of it since the Congress work began. He is as fresh as the month of May. He has done good work, and he deserves the thanks of all of us. The Reception Committee also deserve thanks. I condole with the Finance and Building Committee, because I do not think they will have any money to pay in. I am sorry we cannot thank them for liquidating the debt.

E. P. Monckton, Esq., M.P.

I HAVE the honour to be allowed the pleasing duty of proposing a most hearty vote of thanks to the Hon. Secretaries connected with this Church Congress, and I do so with the sincerest pleasure. You have commenced by proposing a vote of thanks to the Lord Bishop of this Diocese, the head, the president of the Congress; my vote refers to a not less important part of the working body—the fact is without them there would have been no progress or motion—and they have made us walk in the way we should go. No one can have any idea of the tremendous amount of work and the great responsibility that falls upon those in charge of the management of such a Congress as this, and also of the feeling of devout thankfulness at a successful and happy conclusion such as we enjoy at this moment. But in asking you to thank the Norwich hon. secretaries, lay and clerical, I am sure I may be allowed to express my own pleasure, in which all will join, in seeing my kind friend, Archdeacon Emery, the permanent hon. secretary, the father of all Church Congresses, among us restored to health, and to say how earnestly we hope his kind and honoured face may be with us for many a year to come—to remind us of the past, and what determination can do, and has done, and to encourage us and help us in the future by his ripe experience and kindly sympathy. I feel the wording of this vote is too narrow, and we ought to include all who have laboured to secure success for our Congress, whether as hon. secretary or otherwise, from the highest to the lowest. I am not, as the former speaker has stated that he is, a member of the Liberal party, but of the great Unionist party in the House of Commons, and I cannot help saying how much I hope that this golden opportunity will be taken for promoting legislation in the direction of Church reform. It is an opportunity not to be lost, and one that if rightly directed will give us increased vigour and strength and usefulness; and the sooner we avail ourselves of it the better. I beg to couple the name of Archdeacon Nevill with this vote. He has been among the hardest and most willing of all the good horses in the team, and I believe he feels his greatest reward is the signal success of this important gathering, and that he hails as his motto that of Caius College, Cambridge, "*Labor ipse Voluptas.*" (The work itself was a pleasure and delight.)

Sir Frederic Bateman, M.D.

I HAVE the honour and the pleasure of seconding that motion. Votes of thanks are, in many instances, considered as mere formalities and conventional proceedings. I need not tell you that this vote will not bear that construction. I have attended many Congresses, and I never attended one where the proceedings were so thoroughly and efficiently carried out as in this Congress of 1895. I need scarcely remind you

that without our Secretaries this happy condition of things would not have been secured. Not only have they been in attendance daily, but hourly; and the warmest thanks of the Congress are due to them.

The Ven. Hy. R. Nevill, Archdeacon of Norfolk; and Canon of Norwich.

I remember that on Tuesday last the Archbishop of York laid down this precept—that in speaking of others we should always think of their good points. You have been kind enough to do this; but I cannot help feeling that there are sterner judges outside to remind us that much might have been done better, and that there have been many omissions. I am perfectly aware that this is true, and that with all our endeavours to arrange for the best interests of the Congress, we have failed in many respects. We acted under certain conditions. We could not ensure fine weather; we could not prevent the rain. But we did our best to carry out the work. I owe great thanks to my fellow Secretaries, and especially to Mr. Heaver. He has taken the greatest interest in the preparations, and without his assistance we should have been much more faulty than we are. I wish also to express my acknowledgment for the help which Archdeacon Emery has given us throughout. I wish that Canon Mansfield Owen (the chief secretary of the Birmingham Congress) and the secretaries of the Congress at Exeter had been present. On every occasion when we asked for information and advice, they gave it most readily and helpfully. I would also express our thanks for the assistance given by the Remington Typewriting Company. Not only were the papers of speakers written out by them, but also as many as four hundred applications were made to them by as many as four hundred members of Congress; and I ought to acknowledge the services thus freely given. I thank this meeting for their vote.

The Venerable Wm. Emery, Archdeacon and Canon of Ely; Permanent Secretary of the Church Congress.

I have to invite members of this Congress as far as possible to come to the next one, and that next one will be held, please God, at Shrewsbury.

In the evening of Friday, a very large number of members of Congress, and many gentlemen and ladies of the county families in the neighbourhood, availed themselves of the invitation of the Mayor and Lady Eade (the Mayoress), and attended the conversazione, which was held in the ancient Norman Castle, now converted into a Civic Museum. Thus the Congress of 1895 was brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The following circular letter was issued by the Lord Bishop of Norwich at the conclusion of the Church Congress:—

"My Dear Sir.—The Congress is now over, and we have, I believe, reason to be thankful to God for giving us His blessing. Many good and instructive words have been spoken, and many salutary lessons learned. Above all, the spirit of the Congress was excellent, and I am not aware of any word having been spoken which should give the speaker just cause for regret. I have heard on all sides expressions of satisfaction with the carefully made arrangements, and for these we owe cordial thanks to a large number of persons—to the Mayor, for his invaluable help and magnificent hospitality, and to the Corporation; to the Town Clerk, Mr. Kennett; the City Engineer, Mr. Collins; and the hon. architect, Mr. A. J. Lacey, who was responsible for the admirable seating arrangements in the two halls; to Dr. Bates, Dr. Bunnett, our Cathedral choir, Mr. Noverre, and the gentlemen of the band; to the editors of the local newspapers and gentlemen of the Press; to the railway officials; to the Committees, especially the Subjects Committee, whose work was most onerous, and their Chairmen; and the indefatigable Secretaries. To all these and others also, whom it would take long to mention, the Church Congress owes much of its success; and to them I would tender my hearty thanks. Nor can I forget the large-hearted hospitality that was extended to our visitors by all classes, as well Nonconformists as Churchmen. The kindly, hearty spirit of goodwill exhibited by all has been a marked spirit of the Congress of 1895. Our work is over; but not our prayers. Let us ask of God to give His blessing to the good seed sown, that it may bring forth abundant fruit.

"Faithfully yours,

"John Norvic.

"The Palace, Norwich, October 14th, 1895."

List of Church Congresses.

Date.	Town.	President.
1861	Cambridge ..	Archdeacon of Ely (Dr. France).
1862	Oxford	Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Wilberforce).
1863	Manchester ..	Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Prince Lee).
1864	Bristol	Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Ellicott).
1865	Norwich	Bishop of Norwich (Hon. Dr. Pelham).
1866	York	Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson).
1867	Wolverhampton ..	Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Lonsdale).
1868	Dublin	Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Trench).
1869	Liverpool ...	Bishop of Chester (Dr. Jacobson).
1870	Southampton ..	Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Wilberforce).
1871	Nottingham ..	Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth).
1872	Leeds	Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Bickersteth).
1873	Bath	Bishop of Bath and Wells (Lord Arthur Hervey).
1874	Brighton	Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Durnford).
1875	Stoke	Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Selwyn).
1876	Plymouth ..	Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Temple).
1877	Croydon	Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Tait).
1878	Sheffield	Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson).
1879	Swansea	Bishop of S. David's (Dr. Jones).
1880	Leicester	Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Magee).
1881	Newcastle ..	Bishop of Durham (Dr. Lightfoot).
1882	Derby	Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Maclagan).
1883	Reading	Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Mackarness).
1884	Carlisle	Bishop of Carlisle (Dr. Harvey Goodwin).
1885	Portsmouth ...	Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Harold Browne).
1886	Wakefield ..	Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Boyd-Carpenter).
1887	Wolverhampton ..	Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Maclagan).
1888	Manchester ..	Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Moorhouse).
1889	Cardiff ..	Bishop of Llandaff (Dr. Richard Lewis).
1890	Hull ..	Bishop of Durham (Dr. Westcott).
1891	Rhyl ..	Bishop of S. Asaph (Dr. Alfred George Edwards).
1892	Folkestone ..	Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Benson).
1893	Birmingham ..	Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Perowne).
1894	Exeter ..	Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Bickersteth).
1895	Norwich ..	Bishop of Norwich (Rt. Rev. John Sheepshanks, M.A.)

Appointment for 1896—Shrewsbury.